

THE
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER
AND
RELIGIOUS MISCELLANY.

JULY, 1855.

ART. I. — AMERICANS AND THE MEN OF THE OLD
WORLD.*

NEVER, during the three centuries and a half since Columbus returned to Spain with the startling tidings that a new world had been discovered, have the thoughts of Europe and America been so intent upon each other as now. Every man, every boy, has become a cosmopolite, and is trying to weigh the hemispheres against each other in the scales of his judgment. Without being conscious of any partisan prejudice, without claiming aught of the statesman's sagacity, or presuming, as so many do, to a prophet's vision, we propose to give some illustrations of the aspects of America and Europe at the beginning of our colonization and at the present time. Our wish is to exhibit in some manner, however imperfect, the Providential Relations of the New World to the Old, and es-

* 1. *Select Speeches of Kossuth. Condensed and abridged, with Kossuth's Express Sanction, by FRANCIS W. NEWMAN.* New York: C. S. Francis & Co. Boston: Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1854.

2. *Speech of Hon. E. Brooks, on the Church Property Bill. The Papal Power in the State, and the Resistance to this Power in the Temporalities of the Church, as recently seen in the United States and Europe. In the Senate of New York, March 6, 1855.*

3. *The Church Property Question. Letter from ARCHBISHOP HUGHES, in Relation to the Petition of St. Louis Church, Buffalo, and to Mr. Putnam's Anti-Catholic Church Property Bill.* New York. March 28, 1855.

pecially to illustrate the present European influences at work in the United States.

We will take as our starting-point the colonizing of New England, alike from the familiarity and the significance of that fact. When the *Mayflower* left Delft Haven on that adventurous voyage, her passengers little knew the errand upon which God was sending them. They meant much by their daring and self-sacrifice, but God meant far more. The manhood of Columbus went with them more far than with the statelier Spanish fleets who were their pioneers, and stood by the helm of their frail vessel. From their open Bible the free faith of Luther and the free press of Gutenberg looked out upon them in a promise greater than they knew how to interpret. In the cabin where they signed that simple compact of self-government, they put the best rights of the Old World into their signature, and little as they may have thought of it at the time, Alfred the Great with his jury and the Barons of Runymede with *Magna Charta* held for them the pen.

More than any others, we believe, the founders of New England bore to the New World the power that was to react upon the Old World and control the Eastern Hemisphere by the intervention of the Western; more than the founders of New France, for their empire in America has ceased; more than the founders of New Spain, for their sway is fast declining; more than the settlers of Virginia, who were before the Pilgrims in the field, for without Puritan independence the loyalists of the Old Dominion would have been too compromising antagonists to the priesthoods and thrones of Europe. With the Dutch of New Netherlands we will not contrast them, for they were very much alike in respect to religious faith and republican tendencies, and the strength, certainly the commercial strength, of our country has come in no small degree from the union between New England and the New Netherlands. When Hudson's "*Half-Moon*" first parted the waters of our noble "*River of the Mountains*," his vessel of Dutch build, with an English captain, bore in this combination, as well as in its name, the omens of the brightening future of our commercial empire.

Look at Europe as it was when the forefathers left it, — look at America as they found it. Europe had just

entered upon the 'Thirty Years' War, which turned upon the balance of power between the Protestant and Papal kingdoms. How far the Pilgrims understood the vast significance of that war we cannot safely say, for newspapers, in any modern sense of that term, had not begun, nor had the aspects of the contest become very clear between parties so various and entangled as the leading European powers. In Holland, the means of information as to the affairs of the Continent were as ample as anywhere, on account of the commercial facilities and free spirit of the Dutch people. So far as information could have reached the Pilgrims concerning the issue of the war at the time of their departure, it could only have been to disappoint them; and Bohemia, the first field of the struggle, seemed as prostrate before the house of Hapsburg as her neighbor, Hungary, is now. The strife went on, drawing all Europe into its horrors, except England, then agonized with the birth-throes of her own Revolution. Austria, with such terrible leaders as Tilly and Waldstein, headed the hosts of absolutism; whilst Sweden, with Gustavus Adolphus and Torstenson, led on the armies of constitutional freedom. In this great antagonism between the North and South of Europe, victory leaned to the standards of the freer combatants, although it was not secured for them without other influences quite independent of the principles at stake. Beset on one side by France, whose prime-minister, Richelieu, cared only for his own power,—assailed on the other side by the Turks, already masters of much of Hungary,—the Austrians gave up their crusade against the Protestant states, and the peace of Westphalia closed the 'Thirty Years' War, in 1648. This great struggle the Pilgrims left behind them, ignorant, probably, of its significance, yet called, in their new home, to build up an empire destined to intervene mightily in that struggle between absolutism and freedom in its final adjustment.

Look upon them as they reached our shores. Their writings show little, if any, trace of ambitious speculation touching the future of the New World or the Old. It is not easy to get at their ideas of the actual condition and extent of this continent. Little comparatively could have been known to them of the relations of America

to Europe. Winslow, who wrote the first letter from New England to Europe that has been preserved, could have had but a short story to tell, if he had tried to tell all the politics of the continent. Except the Virginia colony, which was fourteen years old when he wrote, and not exceeding five thousand persons in population, his own little company of less than a hundred persons represented the whole English power on this continent. To him the French already northward in Acadia, and the Spanish southward in Florida, were as much strangers as if among the antipodes. Westward was the vast wilderness, its mountains and rivers unknown, — the great Mississippi all the more mysterious for being the grave of De Soto, and the Pacific shore hardly less a fabled land from being skirted by the voyage of Drake. Limited as Winslow's vision must have been, the good man's heart was large enough, quite large enough, to see through our eyes, if our prospects had been before him.

Starting from that point of time, let us trace up to the present date some of the providential relations of America, especially our part of it to Europe. We have placed at the head of this article a few publications that suggest the main points of the subject. Kossuth's speeches, so excellently edited by Mr. Newman, represent the affinities between American republicanism and European liberalism; whilst the speech of Senator Brooks upon the Church Property Bill of Senator Putnam in the New York Legislature, in connection with Archbishop Hughes's Letter, illustrates the growing jealousy of the American people towards Romish aggrandizement. We might add a long list of controversial documents that have passed between Mr. Brooks and Bishop Hughes, growing out of the statement in the Senator's speech, that the Bishop held enormous estates in his own name, amounting in value to not far from five millions of dollars. Both men are not slow in controversy; and although we cannot always indorse the Senator's readings of Church history, we are inclined to think that the wily prelate has encountered a far more formidable antagonist than he anticipated. But let us proceed with our general survey.

I. Begin with the most obvious aspect of the subject,

and consider the relations of the very soil of America to Europe. Our country long waited for the race able to use its domain. Says Guyot, "America looks towards the Old World; all its slopes and its long plains slant to the Atlantic, towards Europe. It seems to wait with open and eager arms the beneficent influence of the man of the Old World. No barrier opposes his progress; the Andes and the Rocky Mountains, banished to the other shore of the continent, will place no obstacle in his path." Thus invited by the very inclination of the land, the European came, and took possession of the soil which the red man knew not how to use. What has been the result of the possession? Evil, perhaps, for the red man, but not evil for the human race. The wilderness has become a garden. Who can measure the harvests now gathered from seed brought from Europe, — the sugar-cane, the coffee, the cotton, the spices, the breadstuffs? Who can estimate the influence of the domestic animals that came hither with the colonists, and stand in such connection with our wealth and enjoyment, — such as the swine, the ox, the sheep, the horse? Let the boundless prospect of thriving farms and plentiful homes illustrate God's providence in bringing the European to America. Compare Winslow's account of the first New England harvest with the last returns, scanty though they are called because only sufficient for thirty millions, and the simple fact rises into grandeur, and the figures are rhetorical enough without stretching their plain arithmetic. After telling his "Old and Loving Friend" of the good yield of the twenty acres of Indian corn, and the indifferent success of the six acres of barley and pease, he says: "Our harvest being gotten in, our Governor sent four men fowling, that so we might, after a special manner, rejoice together after we had gathered the fruit of our labors. They four in one day killed as much fowl as, with a little help beside, served the company almost a week. And although it be not always so plentiful as it was at this time with us, yet, by the goodness of God, we are so far from want, that we often wish you partakers of our plenty."

The invitation has been accepted, and this kind wish has been more than fulfilled. Read the answer in the millions for years enjoying the vast harvest won from

the lands then a wilderness. See the answer in the universal plenty that has prevailed for so many years, and which even the last year of disaster has not wholly changed. Think of the advice, given in that same letter, to new-comers as to providing themselves with things essential, among them cotton-wicking for lamps, and, in the absence of glass, paper and linseed-oil for keeping out the rain; then think of the two hundred millions of dollars' worth of our products sent sometimes within a single year to Europe in exchange for her commodities; think of the incalculable amount of our products retained at home, and confess the work of the European upon the American soil. Consider, too, how much all this material wealth means; how much mental and moral discipline has sprung from the farmer's labors, how much culture, refinement, enterprise, and charity have gone with his success; how much the improvement of the soil ministers to the soul, and the hand of man brings out the beauty of nature, making valley, meadow, and hill-side so much lovelier by herds and pastures, home, and church; how fair our country is to the eye, as well as bountiful to our wants, our rivers, lakes, waterfalls, mountains, consecrating fertility with grace and sublimity;—and is not all an illustration of the providential relation of America to the European? Our fleets show the same fact, for they sprang from our soil, and to all nations are almoners and interpreters of its affluence. The forests of masts that fringe our cities bear precious fruit from our own and other climes. Remember the year 1614, when Block completed the yacht Onroost (Unrest), the first vessel built on the island of Manhattan, then look at the fleets in our harbors, and know what the sons of the old sea-kings have been doing on our shores. Bearing our products to every land, our ships return richer by exchange, whilst from polar snows, from tropical isles, from the far Indies, from our own more golden Indies on the Pacific coast, our people come with the gifts of bountiful Providence, and never since time began has the sun seen so much plenty among a nation as that which we commonly enjoy. Add to the trophies of commerce the triumphs of the mechanic arts in the production, manufacture, and transportation of the fruit of the earth, and the very earth and

stones seem to have a tongue to tell of man's power and God's providence on our soil. Conjecture the future political and moral bearings of our national wealth, its power to strengthen freedom and counterbalance European despotism, and the great point at issue between the two hemispheres presses upon us.

II. But without urging this topic further, pass to another, and consider the relation of America to the races of Europe. Our country, we at once see, has been singularly favored in the blood of its chief founders, and in the remarkable balance between the conflicting elements of subsequent migrations.

There has been quite a war of words of late about pre-eminence of race, and the terms Celt and Anglo-Saxon have threatened to be the rallying-cry of a very noisy feud, whilst it is very clear that conflicts of rival races have been, and still are, one of the main sources of national ruin in other lands. Let us rejoice, then, that, whilst the best blood of the strongest race in Europe predominates here, there is such a providential balance of elements, that no one European caste can tyrannize over another.

Do any ask what is meant by the strongest race in Europe, we reply, that we care very little about the words most frequent upon the lips of disputants upon this subject, and are convinced that there is a great deal of folly in the Anglo-Saxon and the Celtic self-glorification. The Anglo-Saxon is merely one tribe of the great race of the Caucasian family, to which our people belong. As known in Europe, the Caucasian family had three great branches, the Celtic, the Teutonic, the Slavonic. Of these three branches, the most efficient in modern history have been the Teutonic and those with whom its blood has been most freely mingled. Now it is clear that the chief portion of our American people came from the Teutonic stock, whether, as in the case of New England, Virginia, and Maryland, that stock went first from Northern Europe to England, and thence to America, and so became Anglo-Saxon, or, as in the case of a portion of the settlers of New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania, it remained in Continental Europe until transplanted hither in the Dutch and Germans. Call the majority of our people Anglo-Teutonic, Anglo-Gothic,

Anglo-Germanic, or Anglo-Saxon, no matter, if we only know what the terms mean, and designate by them the descendants of Northern Europeans who came to America in the track of the English colonies and language.

Two great classes of men appear in history, — the one class impulsive, impassioned, tending strongly to a sensuous ritual and a centralized priesthood and empire, more ready to persuade than to reason, to venture than to persevere, yet full of generous feeling, and by very temperament electric and eloquent; the other class self-poised, deliberate, jealous of priesthods and despotisms, calculating the end carefully, and slow to yield an inch of their own ground, at once cautious and courageous, fond of comfort, yet readier to starve than beg, suspicious of mere sentiment, and more quick to deeds than words. Of the former class the Celt is the most characteristic specimen, whether full-blooded, as in most of Ireland or in the Scotch Highlands, or modified by other races, as in France, Spain, and Italy. Of the latter class, the Anglo-Teutonic or the Anglo-Saxon, if we must retain a common but incorrect word, is the most conspicuous specimen that we can choose from the great Teutonic or Germanic family to which he belongs. It is he who has given our country most of its character and institutions. The Frenchman on the North with his volatile nature, the Spaniard at the South with his stern, impassioned zeal, were not to rule, and the destinies of North America were to be decided chiefly by the race that founded Jamestown and Plymouth, and gave language and law to our land.

But mark this interesting fact. Although the Anglo-Saxon was the most conspicuous race, its people have been so various in position and history in our country as to prevent their playing the tyrant over others by too close consolidation, and thus America has their energy without their domination. They have been balanced also by other branches of the Teutonic family, like the Swedes, Danes, Norwegians, Germans, and Dutch, who at once confirm their general tendencies and check their pride.

There was room for the other great family, — room for the Celt of every clime, — and Ireland, with other nations of similar pulse and creed, has poured her millions upon

our shores, who have found freedom and plenty here. Her people have done a great work for us, and carried through enterprises else almost impossible. There is a providential aspect of their relation to America, and of the tendencies old and recent which balance their influence. They represent the religion once sovereign in Christendom, and thus hold up for our careful study and practical scrutiny the whole genius and history of ages past, which now stand before us embodied in churches and colleges whose cross rises on every side among our academic halls and city spires. The young, restless heart of the nation is thus confronted and rebuked by the stern rule of Hildebrand, and the new science of Yale and Harvard is startled as if by the spectre of the Old Iona called from her sepulchral sleep in mouldering cells. The Celt brings hither a Church destined to teach the Protestant American many a lesson, whilst it must require a very partial vision to see any prospect of any change in the general tendencies of a nation in its history and progress so indomitably Protestant, thank God! as ours. Well is it that the Celt here has freedom of worship, and that the nation may have the work of his hands and some of the lessons of his Church, — some of its lessons to teach the worth of the divine life, and to point out the curse of spiritual despots. Well is it, too, that the Celt is saved the temptation sometimes so fatal to his race, and that here he cannot if he would take from others the freedom of worship, not easily found where his creed prevails.

So then we remark a providential balance between the races that make up the American nation. A closer view reveals to us some interesting aspects of the two classes who followed the Anglo-Saxon to America, — the Irish and the German, — the Irishman so closely the Anglo-Saxon's neighbor originally, and the German so nearly his kinsman by common Teutonic blood. The Irishman, so impulsive as to be sometimes a troublesome citizen, is kept often within a somewhat wholesome control by Church influences, and his impassioned nature is trained to a conservative order, which promises to act as a powerful check upon the ferocious socialism and Red-Republicanism which are invading us through recent migrations from the European continent. There is something re-

markable in the balance between the Irish and German immigrations, each of which now count millions on our shores. The German brings to us in the best instances great learning, warm social feelings, and domestic refinement, yet in far too many cases he is less favorably represented; and the last quarter or half million that have come over seem infected with the wildest radicalism. Many of their two or three hundred newspapers are so gross and irreverent, as to remind us of what the wittiest of Frenchmen said of a lax writer in his own time, that this man's books always made him feel as if he ought to walk on all fours. Yet of our American Germany, as a whole, we must say that it is a great blessing to us, enlarging our wealth by its decided agricultural taste, confirming our freedom by its decided Protestant tendency, balancing the Celtic immigration by its intellectual independence and industrial pursuits, and promising at last to learn the thrift and quicken the artistic taste and social feelings of the Anglo-Saxon.

Now take all these circumstances together, and we have certainly a most interesting view of the European races in America. There is room for them all, and they are so placed as to be mutual helps and balances. None can tyrannize over the other without danger of reaction upon themselves, and unless an insane ambition or bigotry should succeed in inflaming a miserable feud, no hostile lines will be drawn, and the sons of the fathers of Plymouth and Virginia will join with the children of the Celt and the German in a growing union of interests, and bring friendly feelings instead of angry threats upon the border grounds between them all. The extension of the term of naturalization to fourteen years, as the elder Adams desired, or even to twenty-one years, as the American party wish, is not by any means a proscriptive measure, and has many foreign-born citizens among its advocates.

There is much to approve in the present disposition to watch jealously the aggressions of the Romish hierarchy, and we have no doubt that many patriotic Roman Catholics of the Charles Carroll school will be glad of the passage of the Church Property Bill in New York, which secures to the several congregations the virtual control of their property, and thus puts a powerful check upon the

usurpations of bishops who are bound to render allegiance to the Roman See. France has for centuries set a limit to the Papal prerogative, and surely a republican nation should find some way of entering its protest against priestly absolutism quite as effective as any royal edicts. We see no disposition in our people at large to oppress any class of citizens on account of their religion, and there is, we trust, a general desire to leave all citizens free to worship God according to their own convictions. The St. Louis Church of Buffalo has started the Church Property Bill, and we presume that a large body at least of German Catholics agree with these trustees in their views of ecclesiastical estates.

Remembering that we are all Europeans in America, and that each race has served the nation well in trial and prosperity, and that each has written noble names of its own upon our national history, we will rejoice that the elements of our population are so providentially mingled, call our people by no other name than American, and trust in the time when the union of all races shall present towards the Old World a nation whose blood and features show the blended intelligence and power of every European tribe.

If any exception is to be made in regard to the prospect of a friendly union of European races on this continent, it must be made in respect to the one race that so often confirms and preserves its exclusive nationality by its exclusive religion, and keeps the unity of its Celtic blood by allegiance to the Romish Pontiff. As to the Irish Catholic, it is enough for us to leave him to himself, and to the peaceful enjoyment of his own creed. The sooner he is let alone, and obliged to let others alone, the better for him and for us. Simple justice is the strongest rebuke to his frequent presumption. The general feeling seems to be that we have been too long bamboozled and browbeaten by the braggadocio of foreign ruffians reinforced by our own pot-house politicians. Give both classes the place fairly belonging to them from their number, intelligence, and character; and simple justice will be their most thorough discomfiture, no matter whether an archbishop with his mitre and crosier, or a rowdy with his wide-awake and club, may head the mingled horde. Would that we could speak more hope-

fully of the prospects of the Indian and the African here. Oppressed as they have been by the European, they have had some part in our plenty, and their future so connected with man's conduct cannot be separate from the providential plan which has been working greater things than fancy ever dreamed of in her wildest visions of America.

The coming of the European to the New World is the chief event since the gift of the Christian religion. Thence came the union of the hemispheres so beautifully indicated by the poet among geographers, Guyot. America, lithe and graceful, a woman in form, stood guarded by her twin oceans, and far off and unknown to her was Europe, the continent, square and solid like the figure of man. In God's own time the ocean gates were passed, the European won America for his bride, the winds of heaven in deepest tones and gentlest whispers chanted the marriage hymn, and the people sprung from the union bears the Old as well as the New World's hope in its keeping.

III. Pass on now and glance at an aspect of our country intimately connected with its soil and people, we mean the institutions established here by the Europeans. This is of course a vast subject, and needs to be viewed now but from a single point. This is the simple story. Our ancestors came from Europe to find a home on these shores, and brought with them the essential principles of free government. They kept their faith and confirmed and enlarged their civil rights. Without any common theory, from their own spirit and under the pressure of circumstances, they grew into a nation. To understand our government, we must not begin with the central power and go down to the homes of the people, but we must begin with the households and neighborhoods, and go up to the central power. The scattered colonists wished to follow their business and educate their children in the New World. Hence the laws, schools, and churches of the villages, and in time the confederacy of the States. Our republic grew, and was not formed.

On common ground and under common influences the various branches of our government grew into harmony. The Dutch Republican, the Virginia Loyalist,

the Massachusetts Puritan, the Maryland Catholic, the Pennsylvania Quaker, all grew into an harmonious people, and never since time was, has there been such a national commentary on the text, "There are diversities of gifts, but the same spirit," as in the formation of the American Union. It secured to all its citizens individual liberty and social order, it vested in the township power adequate to its responsibility, and delegated to the central government no more than the needed authority. Thus wiser than France, so cursed by centralization as to leave the whole nation at the mercy of Paris; wiser than Switzerland and Germany, so broken by separate dynasties as often to offer no common front, the United States of America enjoy a confederacy without centralization, and state and town and individual rights without disintegration or anarchy. They are at once free and strong, independent yet united. Thank God for our Union, and for the soil, races, and principles that have made it essentially what it is! Thank God for our Union! it is of itself the greatest commentary upon the providential relation of the New World to the Old. We are to look well to it, that this admirable balance be not destroyed by any foreign ultraisms, whether by Celtic centralization or by German anarchism. The Jesuit's black cap and the Communist's red cap are not our own true blue. The hand of Providence itself has fixed the just equilibrium, and we keep our birthright when we keep this balance true between the central power and individual liberty. The hand of Providence, too, will not fail to point out some remedy for the one great danger that threatens the nation; and surely, if the Free States are true to themselves, slavery must be driven from its aggressive inroads upon freedom, and be kept within its own bounds, as a merely local institution. Better than any reasoning, the facts of our history show what the European has done in America.

IV. Does it show anything more? does it promise to tell what the American is to do in Europe? Here is one of the questions of the age,—the question never so anxiously agitated as of late. The American at first went to Europe to beg for protection as a dependent; again he went to claim independence as an equal; and

now comes a new age, when he may be called to go as a superior, and lead on the reaction of the New World against the Old, as the representative of the rights of nations.

Upon this opening chapter of history, men are very ready to play the prophet. We can at least shun that error, although at the expense of the usual rhetoric and bravado, so far from wisdom it seems to be to say what the hemispheres are to do, whilst each year's results strangely break the promise of the last. Many of Kosuth's admirers in this country were ready to promise him a hundred thousand bayonets to help him against the united powers of Austria and Russia; yet now our Young America looks jealously upon the propagandists of European republicanism, and is far more fond of the old Continental cocked hat than of the Magyar plume, whilst Russia has parted company with Austria, and is ogling our republic with somewhat affectionate eyes. If affairs may so change between Europe and America within three years, what sober-minded man will be willing to predict what issues ten years may bring?

America must be something to Europe, — something, too, in this great antagonism. What that something is to be, only the Omniscient can tell. Yet it is easy to see what our nation is to do to meet the great future.

We are, first of all, resolutely to guard the welfare of our own country, as the most sacred trust ever committed to a people, — a trust precious to our whole race as to ourselves. Our prosperity is not only valuable to ourselves and to the crowds who find a home in our land, but it is of itself an aggressive power against foreign absolutists. Our country thus carries on a constant crusade of peaceful industry, and ideas of popular right go to every nation where our flag waves its stars. Late years in their peaceful intercourse have been more strongly marked than any years of threatened warfare. The mere fact of the success of this government is the best propaganda of republican principles, and every essential improvement made by us of the Free States in self-control, education, arts, letters, religion, and in resistance to the extension of the slave power, tells more against despotism than any battle ever did. No ship of war ever opened such a broadside against feudalism as

the Macedonian did with her cargo of bread, which told Europe that we had of our own raising food enough and to spare, and hearts to spare it. Those loaves of bread did better execution at Cork than Commodore Hollins's balls at Greytown. No revolutionary fund ever raised in behalf of struggling revolutionists has done so much for constitutional freedom as the money with which Pennsylvania paid her debt and redeemed her honor. The Hotspurs of Mississippi might serve liberty by doing likewise better far than by snatching at the treasures of Cuba. No manifesto ever carried with it more amazement than our last census, with its plain facts and figures. We are to guard the welfare of our country, for its peace, prosperity, and union are the world's best blessing.

We believe in intervention, universal and unlimited. We cannot exist and prosper without it; for our nation by its existence teaches the nature of its principles, and by its prosperity illustrates and urges their power. Europe needs, more than our bayonets, the calm study of what is best in our institutions, and is too ready to study only what is worst. Europe is full of folly, and crowned heads by no means have a monopoly of tyranny. European revolutionism has been as mad as absolutism, and as ignorant of the republicanism which protects every citizen's rights, by local institutions guards the minority from the wilfulness of the majority, and secures liberty without anarchy and unity without centralization. Our own country in the hands of our own people, the two great historical parties agreeing essentially in constitutional principles, is doing quite as much to sober European liberals as to check European despots.

Deeply have all of our most cherished convictions of the mission of our country been confirmed by the words of the romantic personage who was of late our nation's guest. His own visit to us gathered about it the chief lessons of history, and showed the leadings of Providence. Native of the country most conspicuous as the bulwark of Christendom against the Mahometan, exile in a land the arena of the struggle of the Greek against the Persian, chief in the conflict against the great modern absolutism which blends the Persian's pride and the Mahometan's fanaticism, Kossuth represents the two

principal strifes between despotism and freedom, and is himself hero, or at least the orator, of the third, now in progress. He belongs, at least by profession, to the school of constitutional statesmen, and his work is part of that which our own fathers carried on against the Stuarts, the helpers of that very house of Hapsburg whose foot is now on Hungary, as in 1620 on Bohemia.

It is very clear that our people listened to him with their judgment as well as their enthusiasm, and did not allow the glow of his eloquence to blind their practical sense to the daring sophism of his principal point of agitation. He has shown much sagacity in predicting the mishaps of England in the existing war; but surely we cannot put the prophet's mantle on the adventurous orator who invited us to throw down our gauntlet before Austria and Russia, under the assurance that Russia is not a very strong power, and could be easily kept from throwing her arms against the republican cause. He has changed his tone in respect to Russia, and may have cause to change it again. It is no longer necessary to question the expediency of committing our country to his schemes.

His mission to this country was more successful than if all his wish had been granted. His principles of national rights and international duties are brought, where they belong, before the bar of public opinion, and will be received essentially as the prospective laws of civilization, that wait due time to be carried into the counsels of nations. All that truth and humanity call our people to say, we trust that in due time they will say. Our hope is, that at least our Northern senates — no strangers to language of plain-dealing with domestic wrongs, ready to rebuke the slavery propagandist and the filibuster — will not fear to speak their mind upon foreign oppressions, and that whatever ought to be said in reference to oppressed nations and races will be said without exaggeration, without rash menace, and without fear. There is no call for threat, no clear prospect of any present measure of coercive intervention, although what may come the future only can show. It may be that the two worlds may meet in strife, and that some blow struck at national rights may array the whole West against Eastern absolutism, and our flag will go

with the standard of Saint George into the last great struggle against the aggression of Orientalism. But before that, and after that, or, better, without that, our great work as propagandists of liberty lies in the peaceful progress of our industrious civilization, the force of our example, the light of our ideas, the charm of plenty secured by toil and consecrated by faith and humanity. Here at home, probably, the principles of European despotism must be met, and put under check, before any great reaction can be brought about in the Old World. Here at home, we are to set bounds to both kinds of absolutism that curse Europe, the absolutism of the radical terrorist, and of the despot, whether priest or king. Our own healthful development under our organic laws will be the best adjustment of our foreign relations. Such healthful development may not only harmonize our own people, but also win, by its own attractive force, domain now held by European powers; and without warfare, Canada and Cuba may perhaps become parts of our country by a kind of propagandism that does not impoverish Europe by enriching America.

In peace our country enters upon this year, so marked by warfare in Europe. A century more of peaceful progress, with careful watch over our domestic dangers, and no throne on earth will be unchecked, no people unsolaced, by the nation to whom God has given a continent and two oceans for a heritage, and for their guide in liberty and law the Constitution of Washington, the open Bible, the free School, and free Church. Let that peaceful progress come, and the New World will more than repay her filial debt to the Old. Held in the hands of the God of humanity, the two hemispheres, like the twin cymbals held by the Levite in the temple choir, when they strike each other, shall strike in blessing, not in cursing, and all the tribes of the earth shall with their anthems swell the strain.

S. O.

ART. II. — UNITARIANISM AND FOREIGN MISSIONS.*

To a young clergyman of the Church of England, who was disposed to question the value of Foreign Missions, it is related that the Duke of Wellington, that stern hero of duty, made answer, "Young man, look to your marching orders: 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature.'" The retort was both witty and wise. There was the most delicate vein of satire in it, as if the Duke would insinuate that the ministerial ought at least to render as implicit obedience as the military officer. To characterize the great commission as "marching orders" was a happy generalization, when we remember that Jesus is called by the Apostle the Captain of our salvation, and his disciples soldiers, and the virtues and graces arms and armor, and a Christian life the battle and fight of faith; while the single-eyed deference to authority, regardless of consequences, for which the Iron Duke was celebrated, shone out in this speech, and teaches us how much more true and beautiful it is, in matters of such high import, to obey than to criticize. Duty is in morals and religion what a straight line is in geometry, — the shortest distance between two points; and those points are the will of the Ruler, and the will of the subject, — one as regnant, and the other as compliant. Men of the world have sometimes a straightforward and practical robustness of conscience, which may well shame refined casuists and speculatists, even within the pale of the Church. In truth, the significance of faith is this very yielding up to a higher and wiser Power, that, for good and sufficient reasons, we are earnestly convinced ought to have the rule over us, "asking no questions for conscience' sake."

The subject of Foreign Missions, now for some years lying in a state of abeyance among us Unitarians, has received, by providential circumstances, a new and forcible interest. An Oriental voyage, undertaken to recruit an invalid brother in the ministry, has opened a new

* *Quarterly Journal of the American Unitarian Association*, for October, 1854. Vol. II. No. 1.

page in the records of our denominational association; and what was sickness and weariness to him may prove to be healing and invigoration to many. In the weaving of that mighty web in which nations are but warp and centuries woof, and Infinite Providence drives the shuttle to and fro, it is safe to believe that nothing is in vain, and that every fibre holds a place of use, and every motion tends to the common result.

"There is a tide in the affairs of men,
Which, taken at the flood, leads on to fortune;
Omitted, all the voyage of their life
Is bound in shallows and in miseries."

We, as a Christian people, may be standing, at such a crisis, where two ways meet; at the present time; and on our right conception of our position and duties, and faithful and fearless submission to the call of Providence, may hang everlasting consequences, to us, to the truth, and to the millions of the race. The striking coincidence that the Indians of the East and the Indians of the West should make their appeal to us in the same year, and that the same sessions of the officers of the Association which were occupied with the duty of making provision for the Hindoos should be animated with the consideration of the spiritual wants of a quarter of a million of North American Indians, is not without its rhetorical, perhaps its spiritual signification. To be sure, our Mahometan or our Pagan brethren may little ween how feeble a folk we are, how small in numbers, how inconsiderable in reputation in the world, and how bad in odor in the nostrils of Evangelical saints, so called. But they have prayed, as the architect builded, wiser than they knew. For God can make the youthful David, with his sling and five smooth stones (not five sharp points) out of the brook, mightier than all the armed hosts of Israel to prevail against Pagan Goliath and the uncircumcised. Victory is not in numbers, but in valor and skill. Power is not in masses or organizations, but in ideas. Though we are small in the census, we inherit names that are a host in themselves, and we feel that our principles have that gravitation of truth which can overbalance a world of mixed composition, however ponderous. For the efficacy of religious influences depends not upon quantity, but upon quality. The forest

may loom up vast and unconquerable, but a single spark of fire, judiciously applied, can reduce all its magnificence to ashes. In fact, the very freedom and lack of consolidation in ceremony and in creed, which have been thought by some to be our weakness at home, may be all the more effective abroad, and make us the flying light-artillery of the Christian forces, operating at the critical points, and becoming a species of missionaries to the missionaries themselves, and converting them over again from their bald doctrinal or emotional faith to a new and profounder sense of religion, and to a more interior, refined, and living piety and charity. At least, small or large, weak or strong, we will obey our "marching orders," and hear, as astonished ears of old heard, the wonderful command of a piety that had no fracture of doubt to question God, and of a philanthropy that "walked large" over such misgivings as "Am I my brother's keeper?" — a command bearing on its front its own justification and truth in its sublime boldness and originality, — "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."

The terms of this commission can admit of no doubt or qualification, for they are explicit and exhaustive. As if saying "all the world" were not enough, it adds "every creature." Jesus, unlike modern philosophers and political economists, made no exception on account of the degradation of many tribes and races, — set aside not even idolaters, cannibals, or the nations that practise *suttees* or infanticide. Looking with clear and deep eyes into the inner world of the soul, he saw that the ethnography of the Gospel included all who wear "the human face divine," however feebly the light of the divine may glimmer in it, — the New-Hollanders living on trees, as well as the Esquimaux buried in the snow; the Indians haunting caves and dens in the earth, as well as the Hottentots burrowing in the sand.

The dream of universal empire has rioted in the brain both of priests and heroes. Confucius in China, Zoroaster in Persia, organized vast systems of faith and worship, which, like their own banian-trees, have spread from single centres to an incredible circumference, and endured for ages. Mahomet and his successors once disputed the world with the kingdom of Christ. The

Jews believed that their Messiah would make Jerusalem the metropolis of the globe, and that literally all nations would flow unto Mount Zion, as the head-quarters of the faith and worship of mankind. The Roman Catholic Church has gloried in its universality, and the Greek Church, with Nicholas of Russia, the ablest of sovereigns, so lately at its head, is not exempt from the same fond ambition. Indeed, whatever really lives, and has faith in itself, seeks extension, growth; and it stops not until it arrives at the eternal barriers, where God and Nature say, "Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther."

But the counsels of men come to naught;—"the truth is great, and it shall prevail." The reasonableness of Christ's world-wide kingdom is its identity with the purposes of God, so that, without any side views of his own glory, he could pray, "Thy kingdom come, thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." Not Christ's reign only, but God's will, his supremacy in humanity, as in nature, is concerned in the diffusion of the Gospel. So, and so only, can the dark and guilty earth be washed white, and reconciliation to Heaven and peace among men prevail against sin and moral anarchy and violence.

The instruments with which his missionaries were to be armed in their holy warfare are in keeping with the spiritual dominion they were to spread from land to land. No sword was St. Peter to draw, and we doubt even as to his keys. Perhaps a pilgrim's staff might support their steps, but with no weapons, offensive or defensive, were they to fight the good fight of faith. The arms of the Christian apostle are *teaching*, *preaching*, and *baptizing* in the august and affectionate names of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost. Innocent and defenceless as he seems to go with only these into the fierce and warring world, a lamb among wolves, he is strong in the Lord and in the power of his might, and more than a match for the hosts of violence and brute strength. Mere abstract truth, though pure as heavenly light, was not relied on by Jesus to evangelize the world. He sent teachers and preachers, he instituted rites and ceremonies, he founded a Church, and he symbolized the everlasting truths of the spirit in figures of speech and in the objects of nature and society. And as marriage has its ring of union, sovereignty its sceptre of

command, and patriotism its starry banner, so he, with infallible wisdom, which the ages have justified and illustrated, gave to faith its baptismal font; to love, its commemorative cup and bread; and to self-sacrifice and its immortal reward, the cross of suffering and the broken tomb of the resurrection. Happy beyond measure would it have been for the heralds of salvation, if they had always kept to the letter of their instructions, nor mingled strange fire with the sacrifice of the altar, nor used carnal weapons to do a spiritual work. Not by hate, or force, not by sword and fire, not by craft or menace, persecution or error, can the good kingdom be built up. The work of God must be done in the spirit of God.

Nor is there any evidence that Jesus intended to limit the injunction of missionary labor, even of the most foreign kind, to his immediate Apostles. They did what they could. The adventurous Paul planned a journey to Spain, and would thus in a single generation have borne Christianity as far as the Pillars of Hercules to the west, while tradition assigns Central Asia on the east as the point where others fell martyrs in the great cause. There was to be no limit nor pause to the expanding and converting process, as long as one soul was bowed under the yoke of ignorance, or suffered in the tragedy of sin.

But human agency was required to carry on the divine work. The truths of Christianity had been embodied in speech, and recorded in histories, biographies, and letters, but the immortal book in which this lore of salvation is treasured up had no wings or feet of its own to hasten to the extremities of the earth. The Saviour's visible presence had ceased from among men, and his voice would no more be heard speaking as man never spake. In this case, human tongues must learn to lisp the glad tidings as well as they might, and human feet must run on the errands of mercy. As the Father sent him, so he sends apostles, evangelists, martyrs, and confessors, to convert the world. While, then, we may query as to the best time, mode, and men to do this work, it would appear that no option was left us as to engaging in the work itself, in some way promotive of the great end in view, the evangelization of the whole family of man. For if we possess a true Christian

faith and spirit, and have tasted the good word of the Lord, and found it sweeter than honey, the delight of the soul and the joy of the heart, we can no more refrain from communicating it to others, than he who has heard a piece of good news can lock it up in his own breast, and not tell it to his neighbor. Religion dies out of the soul that selfishly monopolizes its truths and promises, as a special treasure to be hoarded for its own private behoof; while he who almost forgets whether he has a soul to be saved or lost himself, but who yearns, prays, toils, suffers, to redeem others from sin and woe, is already on the high-road to the heavenly kingdom.

Then there is not only the original command, and the intrinsic reasons both from the nature and condition of man to justify it, but missionary labors are sanctioned by the highest precedents of history. Every church has been, on a larger or smaller scale, a missionary society. To wish to expand and grow would be a natural ambition, even if it were not more, — a devout and philanthropic zeal. Not a year has been added to the Christian calendar that has not witnessed the going forth of men in the name of Jesus, to turn from idolatry and sin the multitudes that sit in darkness. The popular novelist may convulse his readers with laughter at Mrs. Jellyby, and transfix Borrioboola Gha with his satirical dart, but it is poor, mean jesting after all. For it has ever been found, in the history of benevolence, that those who do most abroad do most at home also, while those who do little abroad do little at home. The nations that lead in foreign missions lead also in all the enterprises of domestic philanthropy and the advancement of religion within their own bounds. And it is perfectly natural that it should be so, for the distinction between foreign and domestic missions is a difference, not in kind, but only in degree, in space. A minister who goes to California goes farther even, and fares harder perchance, though he is called a domestic missionary, than one who goes to Canada or to Jamaica, though he is called a foreign missionary. We must not be cheated by names. The reality of the thing is alike in both cases, and that is the proclamation of the Glad Tidings to all who are destitute of them, whether they live at our own doors or are antipodes. The field is the world;

the globe, in this cause at least, is our country, and all mankind our countrymen.

The Roman Catholic Church early adopted the principle of foreign missions, and the orders of St. Augustine, St. Francis, St. Dominic, and the Jesuits penetrated to the depths of China, and of North and South America. The crucifix is found even among savage tribes; and few are the plains or mountains, even of the most inhospitable parts of the globe, that have not been made beautiful by the feet of them that brought good tidings of good, and published peace. The earliest Protestant movement seems to have been the Society for the Propagation of Christianity in Foreign Parts, founded in 1701, in London, and the Royal Danish Missionary Society, by Frederic the Fourth, in 1704. The United Brethren, or Moravians, began their missions in 1732, and soon embraced in their earnest plan the less promising races of the Greenlanders, Esquimaux, Hottentots, Negroes, and Calmuc Tartars. The London Missionary Society was founded in 1794, the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in 1810, the American Baptist Board in 1814, the Presbyterian in 1818, and the Methodist in 1819. The American Unitarian Association was formed in 1825.

It is a curious piece of history, and one that bears pertinently upon our discussion, that, when the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions applied to the Legislature of Massachusetts for a charter, they were at first refused, on the ground that the State had no religion to spare, — no more than it wanted at home. But the society was at last formed, and what has been the result? Of the 380 ordained missionaries and male assistants who have been sent out, more than one fifth of the whole number have gone from this State; and of the four millions of dollars raised, one million has been the gift of the same State. Of the 257 Baptist missionaries sent out, 66, or more than one quarter, have been Massachusetts men; and of the nine hundred thousand dollars contributed, one fifth has been Massachusetts money. And none looking upon our common, beloved country would say that Massachusetts was behind any of her sister States in domestic improvements, or her moral and religious condition. We may be quite

confident that she is no poorer to-day in faith, good works, and home prosperity, for all she has done for the poor heathen abroad. Blessing others, idolaters, cannibals, and savages, she has herself been blessed; watering the waste places of the earth, she has herself been watered, and her rough hills have smiled with a livelier green. The prophet's word was good; the liberal soul has been made fat.

In advocating foreign missions, we are treated at once to the shrewd maxim, "Charity begins at home." We concede that charity begins at home, but it ends not at home. For by its very nature it is expansive, diffusive, universal. It would soon die, if it had not room, and breathed not the great atmosphere of the world. Why, it is objected, do you not send missionaries, if you have so much extra zeal, to the heathen of the Five Points and to the savages of Ann Street? But we are doing precisely that thing continually. City Missions, Ministries at Large, Hospitals, Asylums, Houses of Refuge, Homes for the Friendless, City Infirmaries and Dispensaries, Reform and Ragged and Industrial Schools, Children's Aid Societies, Relief Unions, Widows' Homes, Temperance and Employment and Emigration Societies,—why, it would require a dictionary or an encyclopædia to make a bare enumeration of the countless Christian agencies at work to civilize and evangelize the heathen at our own doors. They permeate society in every direction, and leave not a form of sin, misery, ignorance, or superstition in any sex, age, nation, or character without some provision for it,—some giving, some working, some praying, some sacrificing, or some counselling for its relief or cure. But it would be a tame and selfish spirit that would say, We will restrict our efforts wholly to our own soil, and wait until our own city or country is perfect, before we tempt the wilderness or cross the deep. Not so did "the glorious company of the Apostles." They compassed land and sea, and, bursting the bands of Judæa, made Holy Land in one generation from Ganges to the Tiber, and from Ethiopia to Illyricum. Certainly it is not for an enterprising age like this to shrink from danger or distance in a good cause. Charity is in very truth *at home* in every part of the earth, and all missions are home missions;

and the word *foreign* smacks of that kind of paganism which the Latins put into their word *hostis*. We do not use any of these narrow and contracting proverbs to detain our young men from business expeditions to China, Australia, or Japan; why should we, to "cabin, crib, and confine" our ampler Christianity? Is Christ less comprehensive than Mammon? Has the counting-room a larger heart than the Church? We are not to neglect home to astonish the world by splendid displays of benevolence in distant climes, but we may often work most effectually for home by working abroad. Many a home in the midst of us has been filled with comfort, refinement, and education by fortunes gathered in Europe, Africa, or South America. So in the Church. Foreign missions have not impoverished America one dollar, but, whether in "material aid," political influence, or moral and spiritual strength, they have proved a reduplicating good. The same enlarged philanthropy which, burning in the breasts of a few humble scholars of a New England college, first conceived the sublime plan of evangelizing the world, and raised the Christian ambition of a universal kingdom,—this charity, that was too large and generous to look only at home, and has gone abroad to preach to all nations, has also in its direct and its reflex action invigorated the churches, schools, asylums, and colleges at home with tenfold energy.

It is an important consideration, too, that some men are better fitted to the adventurous life of a foreign missionary than to that of a country parson. They have a gift of tongues, or a love of travel, or a sympathy with new and strange forms of character, or an historical, antiquarian, or ethnographical *penchant*, which alleviates their expatriation, and makes them at home in Thibet or in New Zealand. "Mankind's a family," said our Franklin. The different zones are but so many stories to the house, the countries so many rooms. And while one sits in comfort and affluence in the parlor of Europe, let not another disdain to delve in the kitchen of Africa, or rummage in the attic of South America, or "agitate" in the busy sitting-room of the United States.

It is difficult to understand why this word *foreign* should trouble us so much when it is applied to *missions*,

to religion, — the most expansive of all sentiments, the most universal of all interests, — but should prove no rock of offence in anything else. The more foreign trade, we think, the better. We delegate merchants to Hong Kong and Sydney. Our sails whiten every sea, our anchors are cast in every navigable water in the globe, and there is not a known kingdom to which the Christian traveller does not penetrate. We covet commercial and diplomatic relations with every nation; our consuls, *chargés d'affaires*, commissioners, and ambassadors are in every court and city of eminence. We despatch an almost aggressive fleet to our antipodes of Japan. In literature we put every nation under levy, and we traffic in thought and sentiment with Hindoo or Persian, Arabian or Egyptian. Sir William Jones gathers, with his industrious sickle, a rich harvest of Oriental lore. Stephens muses over the antiquities of the Occident, and unrolls the stony pages of a long-buried civilization in Central America. Layard deciphers the monuments of Nineveh, and opens, in the midst of the nineteenth century, the tomb of three thousand years ago. In science we launch out into every sea, and scour every shore; send Commodore Wilkes to the Pacific Ocean, Lieutenant Lynch to the Dead Sea, Commodore Perry to Japan, and Dr. Kane to the North Pole. We are glad to go abroad for foreign art, sculpture, painting, music, medicine, fashions, and nameless and numberless benefits of civil and social life; and why need we, then, be so dainty of the word *foreign* in connection with the highest department and most controlling agency of thought and action? It is but a poor office Christendom is doing for heathendom, if it send only opium and the slave-ship to the tribes of Africa and the hordes of Asia. It is not fair play, if we wring from every land and sea its choicest and its sweetest, — jewels from the mine, and fleeces from the flock, and feathers from the bird, and spices from the garden, and beautiful woods from the forest, — and pay not back what is better than thousands of gold and silver. The old barriers of exclusiveness are gradually crumbling down; then let not the disciples of a universal Saviour fail to be on the alert, and seize the happy moment to make their faith coextensive with their commerce and their diplomacy. Indeed,

the word *foreign* has a movable signification, and England is less foreign in point of ease, rapidity, or time of intercourse with New York now, than Ohio was fifty years ago. The circumnavigation of the globe, once an astonishing feat, is now an event of yearly occurrence. Burke's description of the New England whalemén, doubling Cape Horn, and pursuing their gigantic prey along the Southern Ocean, sublime in his day, reads rather tame now; for they are doing to-day greater things than these,—discovering antarctic continents, skirting round the North Pole, plunging into the heart of Africa, and sailing up the mighty rivers of South America. Why should we begrudge the mingling with this proud, metallic civilization of the Anglo-Saxon the grace and sweetness of the Gospel, the amenities and righteousnesses of a tender and devout faith, and the melting sense of human brotherhood? Christianity has the precise antidote and neutralizer to qualify this terrible power, that is now careering through the earth, and to raise it from a mere hammer of Thor, smiting all other races and nations with destruction, into an agency of inconceivable beauty and beneficence. What so good to pour into the wounded and exasperated bosom as the love and comfort of the Gospel? What balm of Gilead so healing and soothing as the waters of this Bethesda pool? What is so radically cleansing, so morally tonic, so socially and civilly regenerating, as the lessons of Jesus? What can reform the world, and hold it reformed, but the wisdom and love that have come down from the Father of lights? The Lord of glory confidently took hold of the sceptre of the earth, and in his last words on earth, great for their occasion, and greater for their spirit, he enjoined it as the chief duty of his twelve Apostles, that they should go and teach all nations, and, for the violent and wasting kingdoms of men, initiate the calm, strong, and holy kingdom of God. "For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and shineth even unto the west, so shall also the coming of the Son of Man be." By railroads, steam-ships, and telegraphs the earth is becoming organized into a living whole, and the glad news of salvation will be sent as the lightning, ay, and by the lightning too, from the east unto the farthest west, until the ring shall be complete, and China

and Japan shall cement the Christianity of the Millennium.

Unitarian foreign missions must differ in some important respects from those thus far established. For, in the first place, we cannot regard ourselves as standing between the poor heathen and the everlasting torments of hell-fire. The Creator has not brought innumerable moral and intelligent beings into existence, endowed them, or suffered them to be endowed, with a nature wholly fallen and corrupt, and doomed them to a fate so inconceivably awful as hopeless eternal suffering without any mitigation. We read of no such Deity in the Jehovah of the Old Testament, or the Father of the New; we see no such God in the resplendent face of Nature, mirrored in terrible form in her works, and looking forth from the sky with a frowning visage; and we can believe in, pray to, and love no such Creator. These are the fears of ancient paganism, clinging to the skirts of Christianity, or the illustrative rhetoric of the Scriptures consolidated into formal logic. But because we do not feel that it devolves on us to pluck the Indians, east or west, as brands from an eternal burning, we do not therefore look with insensibility upon their woes and sins, nor fail to see that the Gospel can confer upon them a far higher, happier, and holier life, both for this world and the world to come. Did we entertain the high-strung notions of our Orthodox brethren, we could eat no more good dinners at home, nor sleep well of nights, nor trade, nor till, nor sit in peace and quiet under our own vine; but we should hear the tremendous groans of shuddering Nature, like Rachel, with a voice of lamentation, weeping, and great mourning, weeping for her children, and refusing to be comforted because they are not, and we should hurry post-haste to the work of foreign missions, as the only rational duty which a Christian could feel answered to the call of an infinite destiny of woe or of happiness to the millions upon millions of never-dying souls. Yet we do not behold the believers in Calvinism precipitating themselves *en masse* upon the heathen world, but quietly, coolly, and rather leisurely going to work to establish a post here and there, get up some schools, and gather a few communicants in several years; and we must therefore

be permitted to say, Brethren, you do not believe your own creed, for if you did, if you had any realizing belief in the doctrine that all the heathen are lost who are not converted to Christianity, the little finger of your zeal would then be thicker than the loins of your present missionary interest. Money, ships, lives, colleges, printing-presses, all the agencies of the earth, would be justly cast, in that case, into the contribution-box. A worse doom than that of Ananias and Sapphira ought to be visited upon whoever in that awful crisis of immortal souls kept back anything from the treasury of the Lord. If, then, we are not moved so impetuously towards foreign missions as our brethren, there is a reason for it in the different views we take of the nature of man and the government of God and the future state of retribution. Not but what we see a work of great urgency and value to be done, in raising multitudes of benighted idolaters into the blessed light and worship of the One Living and True God, civilizing them for this life, and sanctifying them for the life to come. Not but what we argue and strive for the universality of Christ's kingdom; yet we would hope to do the greatest good, not by jerking the heathen violently out of all their previous habits and ideas into a totally different element, but by gradual processes of civilization and education, as well as the more decided act of conversion, engrafting a new life upon the decaying stock of heathenism.

For in methods, as well as maxims and principles, our foreign missions must differ from those of the self-styled Evangelical churches. We would go forth with the Gospel in one hand and the axe in the other. We would remember that swords must be changed into ploughshares and spears into pruning-hooks. The once flourishing Christianity of Eastern Africa and Western Asia has dwindled to a shadow, because it had no material basis to rest upon in the changed lives and educated habits of the people, but was only a floating sentiment in the minds of the converts. The Gospel, on the other hand, in Europe and America, has gained an eternal foothold upon the soil in the whole texture of society, in art, literature, government, manners, morals, and education, as well as in faith. James Tanner, the Chippewa missionary, who has come in the name of thousands of the In-

dians of North America to solicit our aid, nor, we trust, come in vain, takes this sensible view of the subject, and while he relies on the Gospel as the great motive power to change the savage into the saint, he would couple with it those potent adjuncts of civilization, that will make the wilderness literally bud and blossom like the rose. Providence has as evidently, in the agencies of the nineteenth century, accumulated the instruments of the temporal amelioration of mankind, as the grace of revelation has deposited in the Scriptures, and breathed in the Holy Spirit, the moral energies that are to regenerate the inner life. We must take men as they are, only we must be sure not to leave them as they are. We must not disdain the humble tools of agriculture, commerce, and mechanics, for they can all be made to bear a part in building the temple of the Lord, and filling it with worshippers, clothed, and in their right mind.

But it is contended by some great sticklers for human rights, that it is not lawful for us to interfere with the religions of other countries; that it is an unjustifiable intervention; and that mankind should be left to themselves, to be as wicked or as wretched as they please. But this is the doctrine of Cain, and Cain's children,

“With heart of cat, and eyes of bug”;

not the feeling of human brotherhood, or so much as a prudential regard to our own welfare and safety. For it is a matter of life and death on both sides; the long and short is, if we do not Christianize the Pagans, then they will heathenize us. Thus far they have had rather the advantage of us, and given us more than we have given them. They have had the *prestige* of numbers. They have given us their wars, their slaveries, their choleras, their superstitions, and their cruelties, while we have too often given them rum and gunpowder in the hold of the same ship that was carrying out Bibles and missionaries in the cabin. We have only projected here and there a slender ray of light into the solid gloom of the heathen night, while they may witness a whole rampant heathendom, flourishing under the droppings of the Christian sanctuary, and within the sound of church-going bells. War, slavery, excess, license, persecution, fraud, mammon, crime, are not, alas! obsolete ideas anywhere, so

that our religion needs constant conversion, and our civilization to be recivilized. We feel no scruples in both giving and taking in the commerce, art, literature, and laws of the world. If we have anything better in education or the mechanic arts than our neighbors, we think it would be the height of absurdity for them to refuse to profit by it, because it was not their lucky invention or discovery. On the contrary, Live and let live, Give and take, Learn all we can and teach all we can, — these are the mottoes of a Christian age. Especially in the superlative interests of the soul, in the remedy for sin, the true reconciliation of mankind to God, and a life and character moulded and growing after the Divine likeness, no option is left us: "Freely ye have received, freely give." "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature." We are not to stand on ceremony and say, Please, Mr. Calmuc, or Mr. Bearhead, do you want, and will you accept, our faith? No, we are to take it for granted that they *want* Christianity, even if they do not *wish* for it, and go and act on that presumption. In moral and spiritual economy, the demand does not create the supply, but the supply *must* awaken the demand. "The whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, waiting for the manifestation of the sons of God." But it has been a blind feeling after God, if haply they might find him; a dumb, inarticulate cry of the heart and flesh for they knew not what of unknown good. It devolves on the disciples of Jesus to interpret that instinct into spiritual insight, and feed their hunger and thirst after righteousness with the bread of heaven. Nature and society are all constructed on a beneficent system of interferences and interpositions, and religion adopts the same style. The sun, moon, and stars are daily and nightly interfering with us, and putting us to bed, and calling us to work, with little standing upon ceremony, or deference to our whims or sloth. Intervention is the life of nations. The Justinian code is constantly interfering with our laws, the old Greeks dictating our vocabulary, Hindoos and Arabs teaching us how to count, and Jews how to pray. In the name of mercy, where should we be, if we were laid under as strict an embargo law as some of our objectors propose to be adopted in matters of faith towards the poor hea-

then? No, there is no law against doing good, speaking and spreading the truth, saving souls, and redeeming the world from sin and misery; or if there were such a law, it would be repealed as soon as passed, for such a law would be itself an intervention, and cut its own fingers; "for we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth."

The success or failure of foreign missions thus far will be judged and decided by different minds according to their antecedent views and points of observation. In the judgment of some persons nothing ever has succeeded. A distinguished Orthodox divine, the President of one of our New England colleges, has pronounced Christianity itself a failure, and not a few declare our American republicanism a humbug, though they confess that the wild beast of human nature has shown his teeth rather earlier than they expected. But if there is any success anywhere, if there is any good thing in the world, anything to love or to live for, it surely is just here, in doing good, in imitating at a humble and infinite distance the good God, in giving light for darkness, and blessing men by turning them from their iniquities. And in this light, where is there more success than in missions to the heathen? Judson might be hard at work for seven years before he could make a single convert; but who can say now that he has lived in vain, either for the heathen, or for his countrymen?—for the heathen among whom he has established points of moral radiation and spiritual warmth in the midst of their dark, cold superstitions; and for his countrymen, to whom he has bequeathed a new, splendid historic name, of saintly virtue and martyr memory, to act for ever as an inspiration of good, and stir the heart with trumpet sound, not to deeds of violence, but for the good fight of faith.

Considering the low and degraded idolatry of the Sandwich-Islanders forty years ago, we believe they have succeeded as well in personal and public progress, under the American missionaries, as any civilized nation during the same period, be it even France, England, or the United States. It is one of the five points of some men's creed, that a negro, an Indian, or a Polynesian cannot be improved, though you should concentrate upon him all the light and heat of the Gospel, and bring

all the agencies of civilization to bear. But there is no reason to doubt the capacity of any race, or any individual, to rise in mental and moral character, if the right measures of influence and culture are adopted. Bancroft has well put the case, in the third volume of his *History of the United States*, respecting the North American Indians, and we have long entertained the same opinion with regard to the so-called failure of West India emancipation. The blacks of Hayti or of Jamaica have made as good progress during their brief period of freedom, as can be claimed for Frenchmen, Italians, Spaniards, Germans, or Hungarians. China was once thought to be bound in an iron conservatism; but the blood is beginning to circulate in her sluggish veins, and new and higher forms of government and religion are already supplanting the old effete ones. We see by this example, too, how deep an interest we have in the conversion of the remotest nations; for they may become, at an unexpected moment, our next-door neighbors, and fill our land with their immigration. Half a dozen years ago the Chinese were at the ends of the earth to us, and it might be asked, What possible interest can we have whether they are Christians or Pagans? But now the scales are turned, and the Chinese are working side by side with our fathers and brothers and sons in the gold-fields of California, and building temples to their false gods, and worshipping in them. Their religion, their life, their knowledge or ignorance of God and Christ, and obedience or resistance to their laws, are working for weal or woe, and we cannot long hesitate to decide for which, on a new State of our Union, and a new page of American history, strange as a tale of romance, and filled with a wonderful hope. In fine, when we consider the low and degraded plane on which the Christian nations themselves live and move, and from which they act on the mind of the Pagan world, we shall probably come to the conclusion, that they win all the success in foreign missions which they earn or deserve.

We especially regret, however, — and the communications from the Eastern world, published in the *Quarterly Journal of the American Unitarian Association*, by Rev. Charles T. Brooks, of very remarkable interest, have made our regret more poignant than before, — that a purer

Christianity has not been carried abroad than Romanism, Calvinism, or Trinitarianism, — a Gospel so heavily laden with the traditions of men, so obscured by human creeds, and twisted out of proportion and perspective by additions of Pagan and Jewish philosophy. We deem the Trinity an error as monstrous as the doctrines of Braminism, though Trinitarians themselves may escape the legitimate consequences of their own views. For the Trinity is founded on tradition, not on the Bible; on philosophy, not on revelation; on the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, and never could have arisen if the Copernican system had been known, that reduces our earth to so humble and modest a station among her sister stars. We heard, not a long time ago, a distinguished preacher, at the ordination of a missionary to the heathen, declare that God came into this world and died. It is sad indeed, that such an awful and impious thought as that, if we will only examine it for five minutes, and really conceive what it means, should be carried abroad, and preached to Jews, Mahometans, and Pagans as the Gospel of Jesus Christ. No wonder that foreign missions are not successful. No wonder Rammohun Roy rejects it, and converts his own master and teacher to a purer faith than he brought from Scotland. No wonder the Indian of the West, James Tanner, cannot accept so thorny a dogma as that, and appeals to Unitarians to come over and help him. No wonder the Mahometans of Hindostan cry for help to uphold the common cause of the Unity of God, and Jews turn shuddering from those who would nullify the principal value of the whole Mosaic revelation.

But the alternative lies here. If the Liberal churches of England and America, various bodies but one soul, they who have disowned creeds and confessions, and fallen back upon the Bible and upon the inner light,—if they who say and think they have the truth in a purer form, though doubtless still discolored with many stains, — will not adventure upon the missionary enterprise, they must not complain or criticise if others assume the responsibility. The Mormons are sending their elders into Europe, Asia, and Africa. The Romanists compass land and sea to make proselytes. The Orthodox churches have dotted their stations on every par-

allel of latitude, and every degree of longitude. Let not then the Churches of the Future, Unitarians, Christians, and others, more liberal, more rational, more zealous for the simplicity of Christ, object to these movements of their brethren, or to the strange doctrines they teach, if they do not lift a finger to fulfil the direction of Jesus, and go forth to baptize all nations into his faith. On the contrary, let it from this time forward *become the settled and received policy of these liberal bodies to carry on foreign missions*, and to do it heartily and with all their might, and we need not the gift of prophecy to foresee that it would raise them into a power and life at home commensurate with their zeal and exertions abroad. For it is not by contraction, but by expansion, that the Church of Christ gains in energy and in spiritual vitality. When we have aired our doctrines on the banks of the Ganges, and the prairies of the Upper Mississippi, and tested the simple lessons of Jesus on the hearts of the untutored children of the wilderness and the desert, they will come back to our own breasts with fresh unction, and press upon us with a new weight of conviction.

No nation on earth has so imperative a duty, likewise, as the Americans, to promote foreign missions. We are made up of all kindreds, tongues, and nations, and owe a debt to all countries out of which we have issued, to find here a goodly heritage of freedom, religion, and brotherhood. In going abroad, too, we can carry, what no other nation can, republicanism, and, what few other nations can, the useful arts at their best estate, and all beneficent implements of a new civilization, as well as the doctrines of God the Father, Jesus the Saviour, Man the Brother, and the Spirit as Immortal, to "create a soul under the ribs of death," and organize the heavenly kingdom.

In days when men are skeptically asking wherein did Jesus speak better than the sages of the Academy or the Lyceum, it is well to revert to such a sentence as these "marching orders" of the crusade, not to recover an empty, though hallowed sepulchre, but to conquer sin and evil. As the eminent historian of our own country has said, "To have asserted clearly the unity of mankind was the distinctive glory of the Christian religion." But what is even more, that unity was not left as a cold and

unpractical theory on the Evangelical page, but set there as a living motive to warm and quicken all generations to love and work for one another as brethren. Let, then, the heavenly counsel stand, and let all the disciples of Jesus heed its grave import: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature."

A. A. L.

ART. III. — MIGRATIONS, AND THEIR OBJECTS.

WHEN Ponce de Leon set forth in search of the Fountain of Youth, he was an old man. He had seen a long life of military service; in the flush of early youth he had won his spurs beneath the walls of Granada, and when the adventurous spirits of the age — and that spirit intensest in his own countrymen — sought for a new world in which to expend their energies, he was only second in the race. And in that western Indian sea his bravery won for him an almost absolute sceptre; but from that elevation to which his sword had cut the way he saw and coveted another throne; — attaining this too, he excited the envy of rival aspirants, and in his old age was displaced from his seat of power, to make way for another dynasty.

But Ponce de Leon was not the man to die willingly. Around him lay an archipelago of thrones, and at his left another hemisphere; should he yield, then, to the seeming fiat of fate, and resign himself to oblivion without an effort? Not so. Yet he could not but perceive that his physical frame, like his fortune, was decaying; his eye had lost something of its keenness, his limbs their strength and elasticity. Could he but recover the pristine force of those natural gifts which had imparted brilliancy to the exploits of his youth, and glory to his maturer years, there was still for him a future. O for some elixir of life, to bring back the strength he so much needed! And even while he dreamed, in day-visions, the voice of enchantment whispered, and traditional legends blended with rumors of the day affirming that

such there was, in the New World, had he the courage to seek, and the good fortune to find it. And the veteran soldier, nothing daunted, set forth, with earnest diligence, to seek for the Fountain of Youth. Bright was his earliest omen of success; Ponce de Leon touched with his bark's keel the region of flowers, where was believed to be hidden the glorious fountain, on the anniversary of the resurrection morn, — *Pascua Florida*, — the expressive symbol of a new life. But fate was stronger than hope, and death surprised the seeker ere the renovating fount was discovered.

Perhaps of all the migrations of single heroes none is more sadly fascinating than this legend of the Spanish adventurer, who, in this last fatal expedition, is a patent symbol of men and nations. Millions have failed on substantially the same hope as did he. His aim was a renewal of the means of enjoyment, and the extension of his waning power. In all change, men seek the more perfect development of some real or fancied good. This is the mainspring of all the migrations which have marked the world's history since Abraham went forth, from Ur of the Chaldees, not knowing whither he went, but having faith in the heavenly voice, believing that he should receive a spiritual, if not a material compensation.

But though the acquisition of some kind of good, not before enjoyed, is the moving impulse in all migrations, yet the variations and different degrees in which noble and worthy objects have been the inducement, and in which only the baser passions and propensities have operated, is a subject worthy of analysis. The movement of dead matter concerns us only as it affects living spirits; the concentration of the primal gases, the chemical affinities formed, the gravitation of the original molecules which first gave a semi-consistency to our planet, the subsequent upheaval of the continents, the scooping out of the sea valleys, the rushing of the diluvial torrents, the monstrous earth-drifts and glaciers of the ancient world, interest, not by the novelty or magnitude of the operations, but only as we see in them the great preparatory movements which fitted the earth for the habitation of man. It is because *mind* set this matter in motion, for the use and benefit of mind, that we can study with delight the history of the lowest fossil, or follow with un-

tiring attention the devious movements of the meanest pebble. Were there no central life visible in all this, the changes of the past would be denuded of all their attraction. And so in the voluntary movements of sentient beings, our interest concentrates on them in proportion to the infusion of mind which we discover, and the evident supremacy of intelligence which dictates the change. It is the lights and shades of human character, so openly exhibited in their migratory movements, which give to them their chief attraction. When made with a purpose, they lift the veil from the obscurity of the times, and show us at a glance, whether spirit or sense, material progress only or spiritual and mental freedom, is the predominant thought.

From a cursory view of the movements and counter-movements of nations, these often appear like the effects of a blind impulse; but a narrower scrutiny shows them to have been based on known facts, or on a faith as confident of results as of realities. Large masses of people are seldom moved without a definite object; and this object, almost invariably, embodies the very form and spirit of the age. These movements also exhibit, with great fidelity, the degree of progress attained by the people among whom they originate. This will be instantly perceived if we try to imagine the transposition of any of these in order of time, or transfer that from one people which actually belongs to another. We shall then see how impossible it is for extensive migrations to be induced, by motives inappropriate to the moral condition of the actors. Set before the greedy followers of Pizarro the motives which weighed with the friends of Winthrop and Carver, and with what contempt would the proposal to unite with them have been dismissed! Looking only at the career of the former, we perceive, without the possibility of mistake, that they were the growth of a sordid military ambition, fostered by the example of despotic power, which had exerted its malignant influence over the minds and hearts of these its subordinate exponents. From the mode in which the Spanish power was planted beyond the Andes, if we knew nothing of the source from whence it sprang, we could not fail to infer that the military *emigrés*, who settled, vulture-like, on the treasures of the Incas, were the offshoots of a society dis-

tinguished for a supercilious contempt of man as man, viewed apart from his extrinsic surroundings, and that the great ideas of liberty, equality, and a universal fraternity were thoughts more foreign to their imaginations than the remarkable beings whom they encountered only to plunder them. Spain could not by any possibility have produced Puritans; these were the result of a far different past, — a past which had borne within its centuries a continual struggle between the prerogative of power and place and the natural rights of man, claimed in the earliest times, and never waived or wholly relinquished by their ancestors. Their great movement can by no stretch of the imagination be transferred to other ages, or to another people.

Few countries have supplied more than one or two movements which can be considered as representative. Of them all, America furnishes the greatest variety of examples. All the earlier nations of the Old World were influenced in their migrations by a common purpose. They were merely "prospecting parties" on a large scale, selecting their claims to national sites, in the same way that the pioneer miners of California selected their respective "diggings," by the supposed favorable indications of the soil. But these primeval emigrations, being rather of an instinctive than reasoning character, need not occupy our attention beyond the mere recognition of their existence. Of those subsequent ones most remarkable in history, several, occurring after an interval of centuries, present strong points of resemblance with those taking place so long before, though each has salient peculiarities of its own.

The warlike migrations of the Northern barbarians towards Southern Europe, in the fifth century, were not the result of ambition, of love of dominion, or dislike of their native homes, but of the simple, unalloyed desire of gratifying their bodily wants with less exertion than their Northern climes demanded. They hoped to secure, without the labor of production, the comforts and luxuries which ages of accumulation had stored in a more genial clime, only to fall a prey to those who had stronger proclivities to plunder than to work. For, unsubdued by steady cultivation, their gloomy forests proved unequal to the support of the increasing myriads which de-

manded food and shelter; and instead of endeavoring to increase the supply by more continuous and better directed labor, they set forth, nations in a body, to find a land where sensual gratification could be had at less cost. The descent of these strong-handed robbers on the plains of Italy is paralleled, so far as the object was concerned, in the western migrations of the Irish nation during the last ten years. Our Atlantic shores were to that starving peasantry the Italy they longed for; and for successive seasons were as emphatically "overrun" by them as was Southern Europe by the hungry Goths. Their object was precisely the same, — to procure the maximum of gratification for the minimum of effort. For the civilized world is agreed, that Ireland needs only a wisely directed industry to make her, not only the garden of Europe, but of the world. But her people would rather emigrate than renovate themselves in their old places, and their movements for the last decade differ mainly from those of the followers of Alaric in the peaceableness of the means employed, not at all in the object to be attained.

A not very dissimilar migration has taken place within our own country, and nearly within the same period. The migratory fever which boiled in the veins of our California gold-seekers was but "mealy potatoes" in another form; it was no less material and sensuous than that of Erin's sons who fled from famine to the hoped-for plenty, and was more sordid, being less the effect of necessity than was theirs. It "had no relish of salvation in it." The great army rushed on without even a pretence of philanthropy or patriotism. The cry of "Gold!" drew thousands of eyes and hearts earthward that were just then vacillating between Ormuzd and Ahriman; and, choosing the latter, they went forth avowedly to provoke a wrestling-match with Nature, and see who of all the train could force her to yield most abundantly of her buried stores of gold. They went not to make the desert blossom with the roses of freedom, or to offer to the aborigines a better life than that from which they forced them. Their watchword was but "Dust," and their only deity "the visible god, which solder'st close impossibilities."

The sordid object of the mass of the first emigrants to California will be found to have impressed as indelible

marks on the character of the "Eureka" State, as did the peculiar characteristics of the Puritans on New England. And if we desired to find the most glaring contrast in the settlement of Christian states, we could not select one more widely different than is furnished in the eastern and western borders of our national confederacy. In nothing is this difference more striking, than in the scrupulous care of the one, and the utter indifference of the other, as to the moral character of the first-comers. So eager in wielding the muck-rake were the first adventurers at the *placers*, that they hardly noted who came or went, until they found themselves surrounded, on the one hand, by effete and demoralized pagans, on the other by desperate escaped criminals, and on all sides by the moral offscourings of the earth. And the subsequent condition of social life in that community comports well with its beginning. Many years passed in Massachusetts before any person was capitally punished, and universal subordination and good order prevailed; but among the El Dorado emigrants, but a few months had elapsed ere semi-judicial murders were among the ordinary proceedings of the heterogeneous communities forming on the banks of the Sacramento and San Joaquin. The trifling derelictions from duty marked in the records of the Eastern colonists sink into utter insignificance beside the long list of violent crimes and general dissoluteness of manners, not yet extinguished amid the hills and valleys, and in the empire city, of the West. And inseparable from the spirit which led them thither, and stimulated by it, has appeared in hideous size and feature the spirit of mercantile gaming, producing successive fits of chills and fever in the monetary and social condition of the community, sadly symbolizing the irrational and fatal struggle for wealth which marked its origin, — an origin destitute of all predetermined plan, the primal elements of which were found cohering rather by the powerful instinct of self-preservation than by any deliberate purpose to rescue those fair Pacific shores from an inchoate civilization, and its scattered, half-taught, and untaught inhabitants from their ancient superstitions.

The primary object of the Puritans being the free exercise of that religious faith and worship in which they

believed was concentrated all necessary religious truth, and the building up of a pure church to perpetuate that faith, their first efforts were necessarily directed to a strict scrutiny of all new-comers; this was essential to their preservation, and the only means of preventing the Puritan migration from becoming an utter failure; and thus nothing was permitted within the jurisdiction of the patent inimical to their grand design. Schismatics were forewarned to take their heresies elsewhere; the colonists held out no false hopes; they frankly and boldly enunciated their own opinions, and gave all to understand, that those who did not sympathize with them were not desired as permanent residents. And it was the pertinacity of some who differed from them, and who, despite of the known wishes of the pioneers, insisted on coming into, and remaining within, the jurisdiction of the Company, that caused the oft-quoted "persecutions" of the early times. A careful investigation of the early records will show, that a retreating offender was never pursued; the most obnoxious proclaimer of "novile doctrines" was perfectly safe from molestation if he forbore to enter the fold. Nor did ever vindictive mandate issue for the return of an offending member who voluntarily withdrew. The whole land was before the dissenter, and he might freely choose his place and his notions, so that he did not annoy or endanger the church transplanted with so much care and toil, or infringe on the civil establishment erected on similar foundations. But this purity and stability, the great object of the Puritanic emigration, was not attained exclusively or chiefly through the coercion of stringent laws; but through that remarkable force and concentration of public sentiment which made a residence among them to a worldly and irreligious trifle, to say nothing of more abandoned characters, intolerable. Everywhere the paramount importance of religious and civil duties met the sordid, the selfish, and the thoughtless. Society frowned on idleness and ignorance, and the emigrant who had so far mistaken the movement as to see in the escape from tyranny at home only the opportunity for the exercise of unchecked licentiousness under the shadow of the colony, was quickly undeceived, winnowed out from the mass, and placed without the camp, as an unclean

thing, if he could not be restrained from offending within it. Though utterly unlike the Californian emigration in its rage for wealth, the policy of the Puritans inflexibly pointed to the cultivation of industrious habits. And their sentiments on this subject were so strenuously and perseveringly inculcated, that two centuries have failed to exhaust its influence. In no community can be found so large a proportion of persons engaged in business whose pecuniary condition acquits them from such necessity as among the descendants of the Puritans; while among the gold-fever emigrants, to accumulate quickly, and spend lavishly, was the *summum bonum*, the end of all their aspirations.

In the treatment of the "heathen people," also, the great emigration of the seventeenth century takes precedence of that of the nineteenth. The former was more humane and kindly in its spirit; the improvement of the moral and religious condition of the Indians was a weighty, though secondary, motive with many of the first settlers of Massachusetts; in California, firebrands and revolvers have been most relied on for their subjugation. Indeed, the low nature of the Californian emigration forbade the prevalence of a high-toned morality, or the existence of religious zeal, nor will any subsequent importation of the virtues obliterate the original impress. Considered in regard to its object, the California emigration must ever rank among the lowest which have occurred among civilized nations.

But our country has witnessed another migration much more remarkable than this, and which finds its nearest prototype in the propagation of Mahometanism. The emigration connected with Mormonism was originally a systematic scheme for appropriating terrestrial possessions in the name of the Lord; the very same doctrine which Mahomet promulgated to his five hundred adherents who flocked to him at Medina, and who were the first exemplars of it. Over these, like Joseph Smith over his followers, Mahomet assumed a regal and sacerdotal influence, and in the city of his adoption built the first mosque, and mainly originated the Koran. The original doctrine of the Mormons was very similar to his; though circumstances speedily compelled them to modify their claims to "possess the land" as "the

saints of the Lord," — the theory of the first collection of Mormons in Illinois. Both Mahomet and Joseph Smith professed to be reformers; but from the evidence extant we must believe the Arabian to have been the honester man, for he substituted a better religion than that which he found, while his imitator in the Western hemisphere did the reverse. Both professed to be immediately inspired and heaven-directed; both treated with a secondary reverence the mission of Christ, while maintaining the superiority of their own; both took care in the end to provide for their individual elevation, and to secure, by means of the religion which they promulgated, a law-protected indulgence of the lowest passions; and their principal point of difference arises more from their different circumstances than from their variant desires.

The comparative weakness of the surrounding nations permitted Mahomet to force a way for his followers with his sword, while Joseph Smith, at Nauvoo, was worsted by the numerical strength of his adversaries; and instead of conquest and occupation of his foes' territory, such as the Arabian prophet effected, he was fain to accept the alternative of stimulating emigration from all parts of the Old, to the Mecca of the New World. But had the condition of the country permitted the faintest hope of success, there is ample evidence to the point, that the mighty but peaceful emigration now tending to Salt Lake would have been a military conquest of the United States, similar in character and object to the conquests of Mahomet. As it is, the success of the Mormon prophet, and of those who have acceded to his influence, in turning such a powerful stream of voluntary emigration to the centre of his hopes, and enabling him in a great measure to consummate them, appears almost inexplicable, and would be quite so were his converts limited to his countrymen. Considering the times, the character of the people first influenced, and the apparently inadequate, not to say puerile, means employed, the extent of the Mormon emigration is one of the most extraordinary that the world has seen. Mahomet found a natural ally to his pretensions in the luxuriant imaginations and susceptible temperaments of his auditors. But the Mormon leader had to deal with

what we are wont to think of as sterner stuff, — with Anglo-Americans of the most practical stamp; men not given to the nourishment of dreams and visions, miracles, and mysteries, but who might be expected to look at all pretensions, if not with the most rigid scrutiny, at least in a common-sense and practical way. Indeed, so opposed was his scheme to the general tendency of the age, and the genius of the country, that we must regard it as an exception to the general rule found applicable to emigrating bodies, and which we have elsewhere advanced, that affirms the migrations of all ages to be representative of the age in which they occur. The Mormon emigration, in this respect, appears to stand unique in history. Such a movement could not have been predicated on any known facts, previous to its actual occurrence; and the only explanation we can offer for its apparent chronological and geographical misplacement is the variety of motives offered in the exhibition of the Mormon tenets, and the diversity of peoples who have been invited to join in the migration. Had the Mormon leader been limited in his appeals to his personal pretensions as an inspired prophet, the responses must have been few, as indeed they proved, until his social system was fully developed; then, the proffer of sanction and protection in a truly Oriental form of sensuality, such as is nowhere else tolerated within the limits of Christendom, had its effect. But even this proved inadequate to swell the numbers fast enough for the ambitious projects of the leading Mormons. So long as the emigration was dependent on the States of this confederacy, the number was neither alarming nor astonishing. The sources of the rapid growth of Utah will be found, not within the United States, but without them. Propagandists of the new faith have been sent through Great Britain, Germany, and other foreign parts, and motives are there presented which have no novelty, and therefore little influence, on Americans. In addition to the supernatural claims made in behalf of the Mormon faith abroad, more effectual arguments are adduced, — the freedom of the public lands, the universal toleration of religious and political opinions of every shade and color, the certainty of plenty in exchange perhaps for a pinched and haggard existence, and all those extra-spiritual mo-

tives which might be supposed to influence the restless and uneasy, who are to be found in every community. Hence the Mormon emigration, though taking its rise in this country, which is wholly chargeable with furnishing the germ for this upas of the West, is, in its immense expansion, the product of that Europe which has poured such mighty floods upon the roots of that tree, and without which, we believe, it would ere this have withered away, and been well-nigh forgotten. The Mormon emigration represents not fairly this age, or this country, but rather the unseasonable flowering of those floating seeds of unrest, sensuality, and credulity, which have been forced into a determined current, and hastened to an unnatural maturity, by designing and ambitious hands. And though neither the age nor our own country is to be interpreted by it, it will ever stand a monument of reproach to the sagacity, honesty, and purity of the times, which had not intelligence nor virtue enough to make it an impossibility.

We shall institute but one more comparison, that between the emigration of Roger Williams and his followers from Massachusetts to Rhode Island, and the present emigration to Kansas from the free States of the Union. Though the romancers of history may have veiled the real issue between Massachusetts and Roger Williams, and painted him as a martyr whom they might have drawn as an intruder on the private rights of a corporation, — and though the popular sympathy for the individuals concerned in the contest may have been misplaced, — none of these militating circumstances can obliterate the great central fact, that in this movement was given to the world, if not the first, the most *influential* publication of the maxim, that it was safe and right for a Christian state to tolerate the widest latitude of religious opinion, and to allow the free expression of the same. And we take it to the credit of human nature, that, in striving to do honor to this truth, its most prominent promulgator has been arrayed in a whiter vesture than a rigid inspection would have warranted. And if the conduct of this “unquiet, unlamb-like spirit,” (as a reverend contemporary described Roger Williams,) was marred in his earlier years by ill-advised proceedings, which made him a “sore affliction” to his friends, does

not the establishment of a new and invaluable principle in Christian statesmanship, under such auspices, and inseparable as it must have originally appeared from the errors of the individual, show more emphatically the power of truth than if it had been proclaimed by one immaculate in conduct and judgment, and possessing the popular virtues of the age? If an idea, new to the times, and foreign to the past, can bear the companionship of fanaticism, precipitancy, and arrogance, and survives the relation, it argues a vitality and intrinsic value, which could not be predicated from the success of an opinion propagated by men of cautious and conservative habits, and possessing the confidence and respect of the community. When a truth enunciated by unpopular lips lives, the glory is all its own; it takes no tinge of light, no element of strength, from its paternity; its power is all intrinsic. Hence when the Puritans in heart and life, as well as creed, struck the shackles from their own limbs, the world could see that the faith and life were harmonious, and the extension of their principles was an immediate and natural result. But when the founders of Providence sunk the conscience-fetters beneath the waters of Narragansett Bay, the best and purest, the strongest and most hopeful, feared that licentiousness, had outrun freedom, and liberty had shaken hands with anarchy. But the great truth involved in the movement, and then boiling and seething in the caldron heated by that heterogeneous collection of "fire-brands," expelled, many of them, from the older settlements, finally emerged triumphant from the trial, and, once emancipated from the imperfections of its godfathers, speedily took its rightful place among the revered axioms of an enlightened Christian philosophy. The emigration to Massachusetts, and that from it to Rhode Island, differed in this, that the first aimed at freedom for self, the latter for self and all mankind; and in this peculiarity it has no parallel except in that to which we are witnesses, — the great movement toward Kansas in behalf of freedom.

It is comparatively easy to acknowledge the virtues and heroisms of other times, and of long-buried ancestors; but it requires a keener judgment and a strong imagination to do anticipative justice to our contempo-

raries. We see the men who are to be the heroes of posterity, under the microscope of personal knowledge and association, with their minutest faults revealed, and their greatest exaggerated by political antipathies and social prejudices. Men frequently act from mixed motives, and their most noble attitudes may be finally assumed under the immediate pressure of a trivial incident, which takes from the honor of the result in our eyes, but which escapes the attention of the later observer, who sees the deed only, not the vacillating heart of the doer. We see, or think we see, among the helpers of the wheels of progress, in this man, a latent, personal ambition, in that, a greed for pelf; in another, mere constitutional susceptibility to novelty or love of action, in others still, a hypocritical or morbid philanthropy; in all, human errors and human imperfections. And, above all, there intervenes too often a selfishness which slights the nobleness it will not practise, and which misjudges the motives of actors, who compete for the public favor, which the critic desires to monopolize.

Looking back upon the champions of civil and religious liberty, upon the philanthropists of other times, and all the "goodly array of martyrs," we see those who were to their own age a mere nebula of erratic spirits, shapeless and unsymmetrical, resolved, under our distant telescopic view, into stars of the first magnitude. We see the light which they originated or reflected, and the multitudes of weary, wandering mortals who have been guided to certainty and peace by the aid of their far-penetrating rays, but we do not see, we do not want to see, the coarse and very earth-like materials of which they were, after all, composed. The great movements of the past are revealed to us, in all their massive grandeur, by the light of their results. The changes going on in our own time, and conducted by ordinary mortals on our own level, are colored by the involuntary prejudices which intimacy and detail excite, and are examined by the varying light of our own interests and passions. Candor is scarcely possible under the circumstances, even if the future is apprehended in the present.

To some there seems little in this age which posterity shall call heroic, or the memory of which they

shall love to cherish; yet there is a movement now in progress, which we believe is destined to stand recorded in future ages as second to none in the purity and nobleness of its object, or in the vast results to humanity involved in its ultimate success. Goths, Celts, and Anglo-Americans have been impelled to distant migrations by the hope of spoils; religious propagandists by force and fraud have changed old lands for new; and the slaves of taskmasters, and the victims of conscience-binders, have alike fled for refuge to the wilderness; some for physical, some for spiritual compensation. But it was reserved to the present age, and the present period, to afford the sublimer spectacle of an extensive migration *in vindication of a principle*; — a principle which is to benefit, not the emigrants, but others, and those others of a degraded race and a different color.

The future will not have to record of the emigrants to Kansas, that they were forced out of their old homes by dissensions, oppressions, or even such incompatibility of sentiment with the communities they left as made their position uncomfortable to themselves or others. Neither the blight of famine, nor an over-crowded population darkened their prospects in the home of their fathers. Neither pressure from without, nor the beckonings of ambition, nor the monitions of avarice, control the great Kansas migration. Not for themselves, or for those identified with their interests, not even for their peers or ancient allies, to whom association and mutual remembrances have attached them, — no; none of all these things move them. The great motor power is the love of freedom, and its special impetus, the sympathy of a superior race (certainly as far as condition is concerned) with an inferior; and for a people who can neither appreciate nor repay the sacrifice. In the unselfishness of the object lies its claim to the highest regard, and its right to the highest place in the history of migrations. The genuineness of the movement is evidenced by the entire absence of coercive circumstances, such as have aided other migrations in which the love of freedom was a principal ingredient. And in this unselfishness the Kansas migration is representative of the age. Not that selfishness is dead, or disinterested benevolence a universal, or even a very extended, basis of action; but

the philanthropy of the present has far more of this character than had that of any former age. It has, by its varied and extended enterprises in behalf of suffering and degraded humanity, fairly vindicated its claim to the most expansive benevolence yet exhibited, in the history of the Church or the world. This spirit has been exemplified by the admission of numerous classes to the sympathies and charities of the Christian world, which were formerly excluded from the friendly care, ay, even from the thoughts and prayers, of the best and purest minds of other times. It is also representative of the age in that it is eminently practical. The narrow ideas formerly entertained, as to the only legitimate and orthodox mode of extirpating moral and social evils, have rapidly yielded beneath the experiments of the last twenty years. Exclusively theoretical remedies have been wisely renounced, in favor of means more appropriate to the desired end. It is no longer attempted to exorcise physical degradation by spiritual appliances, nor social distempers by ghostly vigils, nor national wrongs by empty declamation. In the improved tactics of modern philanthropy, physical degradation is met by sanitary remedies; criminal tendencies, by moral instruction, and the means of reform; the pinched heart of poverty is expanded by participation in a larger and more genial beneficence, while spiritual consolation, once the universal panacea for all conceivable wrongs as well as sufferings, is now reserved for its appropriate objects. The Kansas migration is the boldest exponent of this enlightened philanthropy. It meets a gaunt and dismal fact, by creating a more vital and self-perpetuating fact. The spirit of freedom which it embodies is no longer content to meet a usurpation with a "resolution," but goes out in its strength to unseat the intruder. In the appropriateness of the means is the earnest of victory.

Nor may the participators in enterprises such as this be justly depreciated by the suspicion of mixed motives. Few indeed are the actions of men which result from an isolated impulse, opinion, or thought; complexity of motive is almost inseparable from human action; nor is it always easy to define with precision the exact weight attached to each motive. But in judging of those great movements which affect humanity, and in deciding on

the just meed of praise due to the participators, it is sufficient to know, that, had the greatest and best motive been absent, their co-operation would have been wanting; that, whatever collateral influences were brought to bear on them, the great central idea was paramount, without which all others would have proved ineffectual. Will not after ages then decide, that the Kansas migration was purer and more unselfish even than that which found its haven at Plymouth Rock? The old homes of Old England were abandoned in obedience to the mandates of conscience, the old homes of New England are deserted in vindication of the Christ-like principle of universal love. The pioneer band who have planted their standard in the centre of the confederacy, that they may redeem a continent to freedom, shall never find their laurels paling, even beside the glory-crowns of those who first planted free institutions on its eastern slope.

E. V. S.

ART. IV.—ERNEST'S TRANCE.

"Je meurs! De leur froide haleine
M'ont touché les sombres vents;
Et j'ai vu, comme une ombre vaine,
S'évanouir mon beau printemps."

MILLEVOYE.

"For the NIGHT cometh, wherein no man can work."

[ARGUMENT. — A beautiful youth, absorbed in the pursuits and pleasures of his age, is surprised by some heavy affliction, the nature of which very little concerns either the writer or the reader. He withdraws himself from his companions, and falls sick. As he lies alone, thinking little of his sickness and much of his sorrow, his mind, as the mind sometimes will, rises upon the ruins of its decaying house to an elevation unknown to it before. All things stand before him in new relations and assume a new aspect. He sees in life no longer a play-ground, but a battle-field, in which good service is to be done for God and mankind, and eternal glory is to be won. Still it seems to him, he knows not why, that the time for this is past with him, and that life and he have nothing more to do with one another. Then he suddenly sees that he is upon the brink of the grave; and for the first time it is declared to him that his sickness is unto death. In a great revulsion of feeling, he passionately implores a longer term of years, which is granted.]

A MAN, one day in early summer-time,
Who scarce had more than manhood's threshold crossed,
Entered a tangled wood, whose climbing boughs
Were in their own brown darkness hid and lost,
And laid him down upon a bank of thyme ;
And, if with pious thought to pay his vows,
Or spent with hunting still elusive game,
Or painfully to rid him of love's dart
Where none should see his throes, he thither came,
Or haply to repent him of some sin,
Whose light embrace no tinge of shame could win
Save from the vestal Conscience' purest cheek,
'T were hard to guess. He lay and did not speak.
Lips beautiful as his not often need —
Breathing as his of love and loyalty —
Long in sweet hopeless eloquence to plead
With earthly, sure, or heavenly deity.
Some inward grief was playing on his heart,
Sweeping its strings discordantly, 't was plain ;
Yet his young noble countenance did wear,
In all its pain, nor anger, nor despair ;
But there enthroned a lofty patience sat,
Triumphant queen, and, bidding him disdain
E'en to the deaf-eared dryads to complain,
Spake that, had all the bitterness of fate
Pressed in one brimming cup been given to him,
He with a blessing would have kissed the rim,
And in the hideous dregs new vigor found.

Thus while he lay, the huge trees crowding round
Did screen him from the glowing world without.
They reared their shafts of fibrous granite hoar,
With fretted lichens stuccoed crisply o'er,
Like monumental columns all about,
And o'er him waved their sombrous canopy,
Dark as the shaking curtains of a hearse ;
And o'er him crept a chillness and an awe,
Within him a bewilderment and strife.
Within him powers seemed stirred, that ne'er till then
His loftiest wish had dreamed of, struggling all
Beneath the torpid pressure of a pall ;
Like cradled, dozing babes, that wake and cry
At first, when rocks and sings the officious nurse,
Then helplessly to heavier slumber yield.
He felt, and mused, and marvelled, drowsily.
He saw the true nobility of life

As he had never seen that hour until, —
Fair, bright, and soft, and unattainable,
Like a fair city on a sunset hill,
Seen from a low, damp vale long miles away,
Across a bridgeless stream without a boat.
His soul seemed raised, his body sinking fast,
And all was changeful, undefined, and new.
Time flapped his dying wings; then Time was not.
Eternity rose on his wildered view
And beckoned him. He suddenly beheld
That 't was a cypress grove wherein he lay.
The sounding silence rang a stilly knell.
On him a horror of thick darkness fell.
He sprang; he shook himself, and, staring, saw
The stealthy Night, that seals the eyes of men
In sleep that never wakes to earthly morn,
Bent over him! A poppy-wreath she held
In one hand; in her left a torch was borne
Inverted, folding her in choking smoke,
Which all his sense confused in torpor numb.
Through its grim volumes dimly were revealed
Her marble features inexpressible,
Fixed as a statue's, or a scarce cold corse',
And on them, 'neath a shade of fond remorse,
The unutterable breathlessness and hush
Of one that sees tremendous things to come.
When thus to her, amid the mighty rush
Of feeling that pursued him from the past,
With tongue that scarce could frame its speech, he spoke
His passionate suit unto the awful nun;
And thus his incoherent suit he won: —

“Not yet, untimely Night,
Strangle with fingers black the beauteous day;
Nor scare my manhood's blessed heat and light
With bats and hooting screech-owls all away!
The narrow house is not the house for me.
My deeds have graven yet no monument.
Avaunt! I may not yet thy captive be,
Within a nameless grave's lone darkness pent.
How shall my swelling thoughts and hopes find room
In the strait compass of a narrow tomb?

“My work is not yet done.
At merry dawn I rose, o'er violet turf
To chase the butterflies. Where billows run

With mighty shouts, I ran amid the surf,
Along the shallow shore, with shouts as gay,
To catch the rainbow hues that in them play,
And bounded back with cold and empty hands
And flying steps along the slippery sands;
Then o'er earth's purest lakes and streams I hung,
And gazed into the glassy depths below,
To seize the bright reflections in them flung
By heavenly things, and let their substance go;
And then I roved for flowers the woodland round;
Some withered soon, and some they poisoned me.
My rose-leaves fell, and I with thorns was crowned.
So did my morning and my spring-time flee.
The high sun hangs the basking landscape o'er,
Poised on wide wings of noontide plumed with rays;
And I am learn'd, but not in heavenly lore;
And I have sung, but tame and puerile lays,
Unmeet to offer to my Master's praise;
And I have toiled, but plied my fruitless toil
Scarce in his clustered vineyard's fertile soil.
Wouldst drag me to his presence bearing naught?
No sacrifice? — mine offering all unwrought?

“Blind Night, canst thou not see
My days have but a preparation been? —
But not for thee! I cannot stay with thee! —
A stammering prologue only have they said
To life's grand drama, nor one act have played.
But lately I was forth amidst the din
Of toil and pleasure with my comrades free;
And how I hither came I know not well.
These groves are cool; and I was worn and warm;
I had no thought of sojourn long nor harm;
I knew not that thy dread resort was here,
Hid from life's sunny ways and yet so near,
Nor ever did with wilful foot intrude,
Nor call thee from thy hallowed solitude
With noise of wild debauch or brawlings fell.
Release me! Loose thine unprovoked spell.
Go still the peevish cries of fretful pain,
To coward souls thy dull nepenthe give;
I must, though bleeding, to the fight again.
Loose me, for I am bold and dare to live.
Take ready saints, and let me by delay
Become to thee at last a worthier prey.

“Grant me reprieve! I ask not full discharge,
But promise duly to return at length,
And sue no more on earth to go at large.
Fevered my veins, yet full of feverish strength.
The air without is full of June and life,
Of song, and bloom, and springing perfume rife.
I hear the rushing of the whetted scythe,
Swept wide, with sturdy stride, through thick, rich grass;
I hear the birds' and mowers' chorus blithe;
And unseen waters warbling near me pass.
On these still banks of painless sickness laid,
The free wind comes to me with balmy breath;
E'en the dark waving of thy cypress shade
Seems wooing me to healing sleep beneath,
More than unto the mouldy sleep of death.

“Thou canst not be my foe!
Night, ministrant of heavenly rest, O no!
Thou didst but o'er me bend a little space,
A faint and frightened waif in thy domain,
That my light soul in gazing on thy face
Some touch of awe and soberness might gain.
Now shall thy shadow pass from me; and I,
Composed, collected, active, and serene,
As one whose nightly slumbers sweet have been,
Shall cheerly forth among mankind again.
Forgive my chiding, — 't was the voice of dread
Run wild with roaming o'er the barren past;
Nor turn from me for ever; but at last,
When the broad harvest-moon looks solemnly
On hushed and stubbled fields, and from the mead
White ghostly mists soar upwards, vanishing;
When the low-tolling curfew-bell doth ring;
When I have helped my fellow-husbandmen,
And gifted them, and kindly bid good-e'en;
When my full-growing wains
Wait laden for the garnerers of my King
With store of golden grains,
Sprinkled with dropping red and yellow leaves,
And my tired limbs lie on the rustling sheaves;
When the first hoar-frosts twinkle in my hair;
No more untimely then nor grim as erst,
Come thou, the Night supreme,
Floating with downy foot down heaven's long stair
On spangled blue, dark pinions, dim at first,
As if from distance, then distinct and clear.

Lull me with songs unearthly to my rest,
And bear me upward on thy slumberous breast,
Smiling and lost in an Elysian dream,
To wake and find reality more dear."

E. F.

ART. V. — GREECE, AND THE GREEK CHURCH.*

ADDITIONAL to its real extent, great antiquity, and apparent permanency, there are many reasons for giving the Greek Church more attention than it has yet received. The many errors circulated concerning it in books of authority, the invitation which its possession of the Scriptures presents to Protestant effort, the prominence given to it in the present war, — a war ostensibly for its independence of Turkish and Latin oppression, — the hope which it has awakened as an element for the reconstruction of the future of Greece and generally of the Orient, provoke our regard. Unfortunately, the right kind of books to satisfy public curiosity do not as yet exist. The reports of travellers are hasty, partial, contradictory, and limited to a few points of observation.

*1. *The Rites and Ceremonies of the Greek Church in Russia.* By JOHN GLEN KING, D.D. London. 1772. 4to. pp. 477.

2. *Present State of the Greek Church in Russia.* By PLATON, late Metropolitan of Moscow. Translated by ROBERT PINKERTON. New York: Collins & Co. 1815. 12mo. pp. 276.

3. *Kritische Geschichte der neugriechischen und der russischen Kirche.* Von HERRMAN JOSEPH SCHMITT. Mainz. 1840. 8vo. pp. 585.

4. *The Greek Church. A Sketch.* By the Author of "Proposals for Christian Union." 2d Edition. London: James Darling. 1851. 12mo. pp. 116.

5. *The Condition and Prospects of the Greek or Oriental Church; with some Letters written from the Convent of the Strophades.* By GEORGE WADDINGTON, D.D. New Edition. London: John Murray. 1854. 12mo. pp. 111.

6. *Diary in Turkish and Greek Waters.* By the Right Honorable the EARL OF CARLISLE. Fourth Edition. London: Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1854. 12mo. pp. 353.

7. *The War in the East.* By the Right Reverend HORATIO SOUTHGATE, D.D., late Missionary Bishop at Constantinople. New York: Pudney and Russell. 1854. 24mo. pp. 93.

8. *A History of Greece, from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest.* By WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. With Notes, and a Continuation to the Present Time, by C. C. FELTON, LL.D. Boston: Hickling, Swan, and Brown. 1855. 8vo. pp. 670.

The laborious work by Schmitt is written altogether upon the Roman Catholic side, as the *feuilleton* by Waddington, and the pamphlet by the author of "Proposals for Christian Union," are intended to sustain the Church of England view, — and, of course, are equally unsatisfactory because so one-sided. Those that could have really enlightened us have been slow to speak; and those who have handled the subject at all have found it easier to rehearse the past than to illustrate the present or prophesy the future. So that the most contradictory opinions prevail, even amongst those who have visited Greece and enjoyed the best opportunities of intelligence.

A necessary preliminary to a satisfactory view of the Greek Church is a view of the Greek people, — their possibilities and probabilities, their genius and spirit. If they merit the common reproach of scoundrelism, no religion embosomed in such general corruption can be expected to flourish. If, on the other hand, they justify Philhellenist eulogy, no nation so quick-sighted, self-willed, vainglorious, and ardently progressive will long content itself with an ignorant hierarchy, nor pretend to enjoy the drowsy mummary of an effete ritual. It is just here that, in presenting a middle view, we shall satisfy neither party, while we hope to approve ourself to the common sense of the unprejudiced. We believe in the continuance of Greek Catholicism, because it is adapted to Greek nationality. We believe in its development, because we are confident that the people are advancing, however slowly. We are very sure that it cannot amalgamate with Roman Catholicism, nor indeed with any existing church, because it honors itself as the only "Orthodox" Christianity; because it is popularly regarded as the essence of Greek nationality; because some of its peculiarities it believes, like its Oriental robes and its baptism by trine immersion, to be peculiarly Apostolic.

When, in 1833, Otho succeeded with his absolute monarchy to the despotic presidency of Capo d'Istria, he found an exhausted people, a bleeding country, a degraded nationality, a fiery factiousness, a fearful spirit of brigandage: — but, on the other side of the picture, he found the most flexible, artistic, hopeful people in existence, for whom everything needed to be done, but who

were ready to suffer everything for the glory of Hellas. They expected taxation, but it was to be for education, for road-making, for political elevation. They knew that, instead of the coveted republic, they were to possess a monarchy,—a foreign prince sustained at first by foreign bayonets; but they expected of the superior enlightenment of the Allied Powers one who would rule for their good,—in a spirit of wise forecaste, if not of unselfish philanthropy. The mistakes which any other royal puppet might have committed this boy-king from Bavaria did not escape. He surrounded himself with Bavarian ministers, who cared not to know the language of the country; who transplanted their German politics to the uncongenial soil of Attica; who acted as if a long-enslaved race needed to be kept down, not to be lifted up. The first thing which they set about was a crowning blunder: the millions borrowed of the great powers were lavished upon a hospital-like palace, of immense extent, for a childless pair, but glittering in peerless marble, on a point little less conspicuous than the renowned Acropolis; but they have never built more than one road, and that of a few miles' extent, and manifestly for the royal comfort, from the Peiræus to Athens. The already bankrupt nation Otho has burdened with a debt to foreign governments, for even the interest of which he was unable to make any provision; as, thanks to his army establishment, the government plunges itself annually deeper and deeper into hopeless embarrassment. He erected, to be sure, a school system of acknowledged excellence, headed by a university, under all the circumstances truly noble; but he has left robbery and murder to go on nearly the same, has abandoned many parts of the country to utter insecurity, and frequently pardons out of prison convicted highwaymen. He has yielded to the public demand a constitution very attractive upon paper, and highly lauded by Professor Felton; but remarkable for a provision which puts the national legislature completely under the thumb of this autocratic king. The Senate is of royal appointment: that ought not to surprise us: but three representatives have to be elected in each qualified community, only one of whom is selected by the king as the actual member. With the unlimited bribery which Otho has exercised

both before and after election, this constitution is nothing less than an insult. Yearly, a hundred legislators assemble at the Capitol to waste nearly a twelvemonth in voting through every government measure, in providing profitable jobs for their friends, in entirely disregarding crying national wants, and, most of all, in magnificent orations to their own vainglory.

If the best-administered government is generally the best, Otho's may claim to be what Young Athens calls it, the worst. During these twenty-two years it has succeeded in changing universal enthusiasm into almost as universal contempt; it has conferred not a single blessing upon its subjects which was not almost certain without its help; it has hindered national development as much as its timid bureaucracy dared to stem the tide; it has crushed the public resources under a wantonly aggravated and perfectly hopeless debt; it does no manner of justice to national character, probably not being able to perceive what is excellent in this rising race, but gives the utmost vigor to the violence of faction, the licentiousness of debate, the lawlessness of the ruder peasantry, the tendency to deeds of blood.

Possibly it may be thought, that Grecian emancipation was a political blunder, and that the people deserved nothing better than Turkish serfdom; some are even found to argue, with Urquhart, that it is the duty of the Allied Powers to replace them beneath the Ottoman yoke; and that the battle of Navarino, which insured independence, was what Wellington thought it, a monstrous error. Such persons represent the whole race as utterly degenerate: in face of the substantial progress made during a quarter of a century's emancipation, in spite of the whole nation's remarkable thirst for knowledge, their spiritual freedom, their noble aspirations, their willingness to sacrifice for the public good, they are said to be composed of three vile elements, "liar, robber, slave."

The first charge, that of falsehood, is the most serious. Two centuries of the bitterest bondage were enough to have made honesty somewhat rare, had not the Greek been remarkable for ingenuity rather than accuracy of statement, for versatility more than integrity of character. From the Apostle Paul, who writes to Titus that "one of themselves" called "the Cretans always liars,"

an unbroken testimony reaches our time in proof of this national infirmity. Michael the Eighth, pronounced by the historian a fac-simile of the Greek emperors, was "an inborn liar"; while a Greek satirist of the fourteenth century asserts of his own people, that "their tongue spoke one thing, their mind meditated another, and their actions accorded with neither." The noble story of their Revolution is often sullied with treachery, as where the Turkish garrison were promised a safe passage out of the Saint Spiridion monastery, but were nearly all murdered as they came forth.* The only thing in which there is any approach to an agreement among travellers regards the general mendacity of the Greek wherever he is found, from the boatman, hardly content with four times his proper fare from the American he professes to venerate, to the Consular Agent of the United States, who was wont to provide the traveller with a contract which he was obliged to pay for, and was certain to find a fraud when it was too late.†

But then, as a nation, the Greeks are brave, eloquent, hospitable, intelligent, and zealous to improve. So long as the gallant defence of Missolonghi is remembered, and such names as Miaulis and Maurocordato are treasured as household words, not a word need be said about their national bravery. Another quality, their boasted "euglottia," is really without a parallel. In the marketplace, the coffee-house, the legislative assembly, flows the Pactolus of eloquent speech. Recovering rapidly their ancient tongue, more than any other people they aspire after purity of diction, are eager to banish every foreign word, and strive together to adapt the language of Demosthenes to their new wants, rather than borrow an iota from a culture inferior to their own. The English suggest that this "liberty of prophesying" is excessive; that the Athenian parliaments ought to be abridged; that these endless talkers had better be at work. But Greece finds, as America does, that this earnest discussion is not all an evil; that through an

* Felton and Smith's History of Greece, Chap. LIII. § 14.

† Upon complaint to the Department at Washington, these rogues have generally been replaced by American citizens, the only persons that ought ever to have been made our foreign representatives.

unfettered press it educates the public mind, directs attention to notorious abuses, gives a safe vent to indignant feeling, indicates to intelligent administrators the path which they ought to pursue, and is infinitely to be preferred to that apathy which stifles hope and deadens the soul. The great Revolution is considered as having given the decisive tendency to a pure Hellenism; and a great part of Greek scholarship is successfully directed to the entire recovery of a language whose preservation is one of the most remarkable facts in literary history. An English Professor of Greek describes the present dialect of Athens as the only form of speech at once thoroughly ancient and thoroughly modern, invaluable to Europe as an unbroken link between the most ancient civilization and the most modern, invaluable to the Greeks as a nervous system of national life, and a finely ramified network of homogeneous culture.

There is no other land which welcomes the stranger so warmly, especially if he is an American. There is no other where even the poorest of the poor counts it a privilege to share his scanty meal with the wayfarer; and the "well-off" resent compensation for bed or board as an insult. The fashion of entertaining the guest first, and asking his name afterwards still prevails, as if to present the traveller a faithful picture of classic times. And the spirit of those Grecian homes proves that the iron of servitude did not rust into their souls: their purity is in strange contrast with the defilement of Italy under the same sky; fraternal affection is as touchingly manifested as in Germany; reverence to parents is far enough from being extinct, and through all their destitution of what we esteem necessities, contentedness and good cheer prevail.

Lord Carlisle's "Diary in Greek Waters" dwells upon the interesting fact, that many house-servants at Athens are poor boys from the country, working for their food, that they may attend upon a University-class. In no country are greater sacrifices made to obtain an education. "One meal a day," in order to keep a family at school, is no idle word among the country poor; Greek merchants doing business in foreign ports have frequently sent home generous contributions to this good cause. Professor Felton gave particular attention to this sub-

ject while recently in Greece, and his report is the more valuable because of his familiarity with the public-school system among us, and the prominent facts must have surpassed all his expectations. A national movement is taking place in this direction which does not depend upon the government, and which is certain finally to react on the Church. Besides the thirty newspapers now issued from the Greek press in perfect freedom, besides the literary journals, the historical works, and the popular songs, a single one of the book firms at Athens issues annually six hundred thousand text-books for the schools, the gymnasia, and the University, — a vast amount, considering how many families are too poor even to own a chair or a table, perhaps a fork or a metal spoon.

Inasmuch as this point bears powerfully on the Church of the Future, we are tempted to dwell upon it a moment longer. During all the Moslem sway, the Greek looked down upon his tyrant as a stupid beast; the first thought in casting off this groaning load was of universal education: the old love of artistic culture seems never to have grown cold. And now, in the most beautiful and aristocratic street of the regenerated city, stand these two beautiful and perfectly significant structures, the Panepistemeion and the Parthenogogeion, — both of them national institutions, welcoming all the earnest young men and young women of Hellas, both fully attended and ably conducted, and exerting in every respect an admirable influence. For a million of recently emancipated serfs, it is something to possess and support a University of forty professors and six hundred students, a full public High School for Females, in addition to Dr. Hill's flourishing seminary, three hundred and ten schools of mutual instruction, called "Demotic," eighty-five "Hellenic," and seven Gymnasia. "Can you doubt," says Saripolos, "that this Greek spirit, so agile and subtle, will one day dominate the thick and hard Muscovite intellect?"

The most signal failure of King Otho has been in his neglect of agriculture.* When, in riding over a naturally fertile soil, you ask why these ancient grain-fields

* In the very first royal proclamation, February 6, 1833, particular reference was made to the "wasted fields" of the kingdom of Hellas.

are all a waste, the answer is, "The bad government, Sir!" It is perfectly absurd to expect a country destitute of navigable streams to yield abundant crops, where no roads exist for their transportation to market; and in Europe highways are always a government enterprise, the people no more venturing on their construction than upon the erection of a palace or a prison. It was rather ominous, that the king* who lies under the reproach of having spent on frescos and galleries the sums for which the Bavarian highways were crying aloud, should have given a sovereign to a land whose first necessity was that very facility of communication which Munich has wanted so much. Agriculture, not art, the farm, not the palace, should have been the first thought and the leading measure of Otho's administration. Those borrowed millions, invested in draining the swamps, bridging the streams, restoring the ancient highways, supplying modern ploughs and better breeds of cattle, would have yielded an immense return in national income, would never have been the theme of patriotic indignation, nor opened an abyss of debt threatening to bury in its grave one newly risen from the dead. But after all these years of constitutional and unconstitutional royalty, the desert is a desert still, the marshes breed just as much malaria, tillage is quite as barbarous, the farmer is if possible more oppressed than ever by merciless taxation, and national imports frightfully exceed exports. True, there has been some improvement on the days of semi-barbarous servitude; but this is mostly upon the surface, is confined to favored regions, is without even the concurrence of government, which has meddled with everything else, and given over this great interest to antiquated customs and financial destitution.

In one respect the government could not hinder, though it does not appear to have helped, national progress. There is hardly a better sailor in existence than the Greek. Surrounded by that ever-lovely sea, he takes to it as the duck to the nearest pond. That little Syra, where the Mediterranean steamers stop regularly on the

* Otho's father had been the first to take an interest in the Greek struggle, and had furnished substantial material aid.

route to and from Constantinople, is rather a marvellous exhibition of this commercial prosperity. In 1830, says Macculloch, in his valuable *Gazetteer*, the island numbered forty-five hundred inhabitants; but, owing to its central situation and its superior harbor, it now contains about twenty-seven thousand. The official report of the Greek marine gave a tonnage of some sixty-one thousand for the whole kingdom in 1821, against more than two hundred and forty-seven thousand tons in 1852. In the great cities of the world, in London and Trieste, in Venice and Odessa, in Alexandria and Constantinople, are to be found exceedingly prosperous Greek merchants, who have not forgotten their native land, and will yet augment its brightening future. A great part of the carrying trade of the Mediterranean, when not performed by the Austrian and other steamers, is in the hands of Hellenists; and all accounts agree in representing them as admirable sailors, agile, hardy, and full of enterprise. As this is a providential direction, and not in any degree a government affair, as it has a double foundation in their mobility of character and their position in the bosom of the *Ægean*, we may expect to see Grecian commerce becoming more and more conspicuous, until the glory belonging to better days shall rest upon its rising flag again. Already far advanced in comparison with their old masters, the scale will turn still more, until no Turkish vessel will presume to face them on an element so peculiarly their own. Had the Sultan dared to trust himself to the "perfidious Greek," he might have been as strong as he is feeble in this department of service; possessing, as he does, the finest seaports, and one of the most central sea-coasts, in the world.

Having thus seen that there are materials enough in Greece, only not yet wrought into shape, but rapidly taking available form in education and in commerce,—what shall be said of that Church so prominent in the most interesting struggle of our day? Here again there is abundant opportunity for the most opposite opinions; and we shall be obliged to side with either party to a degree. One traveller sees nothing but a disgusting routine, an endless ritual, a tawdry ceremony, a stupid priesthood, an indifferent public, a doctrine not much

better than the faintest shadow of Christianity, — and of course, when his book is written, it is full of amazement, if not indignation, that anything should be hoped from this Nazareth.

Another visitor, fresh from Moslem stupor, finds the free circulation of the Scriptures, occasional preaching, no doctrine of indulgences, a married and therefore virtuous, an honest if uneducated clergy, nothing akin to the ambitious despotism of Rome, or the political intrigues of Jesuitism; and so he thanks God and takes courage, and writes his book predicting the restoration of a purified cross to the magnificent dome of Saint Sophia, and is ridiculed by his brother Britons as a crazy Philhellenist.

In all such conflicting statements, as in every considerable quarrel, there is truth on either side. Superficially regarded, the Greek Church might be ranked below Islamism, and is frequently so rated upon the spot by disgusted observers; yet in its doctrines, its government, its whole position, there is everything to hope.

The worst daubs in the world are those pictured saints which hang around many a Greek shrine; — there is said to be a kind of piety in making them as homely as possible, as Egypt felt itself forbidden by superstitious reverence to make its sculptured deities as graceful as its horses; — and the limbs as well as “the glory” of a Greek St. George are sometimes a huge piece of silver or gold covering over half the portrait, and making rather a ludicrous impression on the foreign sight-seer. As to the public ceremonial, either at Athens or Jerusalem, either in the ordinary mass or upon high festivals, it is disgusting beyond description, — the most repulsive worship anywhere found short of actual heathenism, — in a word, a perpetual snore. The prayers, which fill twenty folios, are rattled off as rapidly as possible, because of their interminable length, sometimes without any auditory, often with but a score of hearers. In the Russian-Greek Church we were assured that the prayer for the royal family could not be finished in half an hour; and we suppose that in the exclusively national Church King Otho is remembered at equal length on festival-days, especially on that great day for royalty, “Orthodox Sunday.” And yet, three times every day this ceremony

must be despatched, at matins, vespers, and before noon, at exhausting length, the priest within the folded gates of the inner sanctuary reciting nasally what was intended for a choir, and in such haste, that only a word can be distinguished here and there. The most ancient ritual, that of St. James, is used only once a year; that of St. Basil, composed about A. D. 370, is chiefly used during Lent; the common one is ascribed to St. Chrysostom, and varies from day to day, and from one part of the day to another. All the attendant ceremonies, baptism by immersion, the visitation of the sick, the burial rite, when each person holds a lighted candle, occupy so much time, that, when we take into account the poverty of the priests, their characteristic humility and want of education, hope from this quarter seems to wax faint, and we can hardly restrain our surprise that our worthy countryman, Dr. King, braving so many perils and making so many sacrifices for Protestant Christianity, has found so little foothold even in courtly Athens.

But then, by way of compensation, is the free circulation of the Scriptures, which Protestants, whom the constitution prohibits from proselyting, devote themselves to with wise zeal. And there is the pulpit, an instrument of regeneration among a people naturally eloquent, which cannot always wear this droning muzzle. The statement has been made in high quarters, that there is no preaching at present; but the Russian portion of the Greek Church discourse commonly from a manuscript upon the desk, and in the National Church of Greece a portion of the priests are regularly appointed to this added duty, and enjoy the privilege of the pulpit to the exclusion of their weaker brethren.

And next, the theology of the Greek Church is not so bad as might appear. During the dark ages, Transubstantiation, which was no part of its primitive persuasion, crept in through Romish subtlety; and the communion service, which bears exclusively the name of "Liturgy," reads, "that every true Christian ought to be assured that, in this most exalted mystery, he does not partake of the simple bread and common wine, but of the real body of Christ himself." But the communion is freely administered in both kinds to the people, nor has there ever been any sale of indulgences, nor any doc-

trine of purgatory, so profitable to a mercenary priesthood; and from the fact, that, before any ceremony is performed, a hard bargain is commonly driven with the poor* clergymen regarding the fee which is almost his only livelihood, and that this clergyman is dependent upon the people of his charge for the support of a family as well as of himself, we see that any approach to a Romish despotism is nipped in the bud. Their monasteries† have always borne a blameless reputation, are generally reduced in finances as well as numbers, and might, without serious difficulty, return their cheerless drones to those walks of industry where they are so much needed. In the Romish system, the monk is essential to the Pope; in papal lands the monastery has still vast power. It is the reverse in the Greek Church; the Patriarch, not coveting temporal dominion, does not seem to lean on this organized fanaticism; the National Church does not agree with it, and every step of recent progress is hostile to its existence.

But the grand distinction of the Eastern from the Western Church is one which pledges to it a brighter future. Because there was always a supreme civil head to the nation, there could not be a spiritual one; the existence of a Greek emperor nullified a Greek pope. One side of the Adriatic was the throne of a despotism which pretended to govern the civilized world; on the other side sat a similar superstition, upon a humble footstool, beneath a sometimes unfriendly government, and therefore never able to stifle spiritual freedom, never disposed to usurp temporal power, but commonly poor as Rome was rich, indolent as Rome was zealous, lowly as Rome was proud, and local as Rome was universal. So that the obstacle to progress presented by a body so intelli-

* The extreme destitution which we have ourselves witnessed among the Oriental clergy is some apology for facts like the following. Cyril Athanasius, the Bishop of Bakaah, sent after the English traveller, Dr. Elliott, whom he had lodged, demanding payment for his hospitality. A single piece of gold was sent back in answer to the unreasonable request, with which the prelate professed not to be compensated for the expense of the entertainment, but afterwards owned the falsehood and asked forgiveness.

† It is an interesting fact, that the vast increase of monks was a main cause of the surrender of Constantinople to the Turks, — “thirty monasteries being reckoned on the banks of one canal of the city,” — and only six thousand soldiers engaging in the defence of the very extended walls. Dr. King's *Rites and Ceremonies*, p. 367.

gent, united, zealous, persevering, and isolated as the priests, need never be feared in the Oriental Church; nor is there any part of its system which can be turned to good account by Romanism.

The orthodox Greek, and he esteems himself the most orthodox of Christians, hates the Pope little less than the Devil; for at one time a rival patriarch was nominated at Rome, and sent with a corps of bishops to take possession of the See of Constantinople, a usurpation resented even by the Turks; and a little later, in the seventeenth century, the French monks persuaded the Sultan to destroy the first printing-press ever carried among the Greeks, and thus "blasted the first bud from the seared tree of learning." And later events have only brought this hatred, often so intense among those who believe most nearly alike, into glaring prominence before the civilized world.

In the present war Russia was not wholly wrong. Religious privileges,* belonging to that Church which has no other royal protector save the Czar, were rudely torn from its accustomed hands, and made the exclusive enjoyment of its envious enemy, the Latin Catholic. Insults were inflicted upon it, — filth, for instance, thrown upon those who were passing in to worship at the Holy Sepulchre, — which no persons that respected themselves could tolerate. The protest made by Russia, in the name of Greek Christianity,† was a necessity; its demand of protection against future injury was proper enough, in treating with so feeble and easily swayed a Sultan as Abdul Medjid.‡ A guaranty might

* Dr. Southgate, once Missionary Bishop of Constantinople, takes the ground that the Greeks are right in the controversy regarding the Holy Places. "There can be no reasonable question that they belong of right to the Eastern Church, both because their original foundation and first possession were Oriental, and because they fall within the dioceses of Oriental bishops."—*War in the East*, p. 6.

† The doubt which some affect to feel regarding Russia's being the acknowledged champion of the Greek Church, ought to vanish before such facts as the Greek clergy's forming the escort with which Menschikoff made his triumphal entry into Constantinople, when the demand was made which paved the way to the present strife. *War in the East*, p. 11.

‡ As by a treaty, dated 1673, the Sultan granted to Louis XIV. "that the king of France be recognized the sole *protector* of the Catholics in the East," that is, of the Latin subjects of the Ottoman power, the similar demand of the Czar for a Protectorate of the Greek Christians could not be resisted on the ground of any special injustice.

have been given, to be sure, which would not have shaken the integrity of the Ottoman empire; but none such was proposed; and the commencement of the present war seems to have been, as Europe is now governed, inevitable.

As we scan the Greek religion more closely in comparison with the Latin, every difference seems to be in favor of the weaker and humbler party. The marriage of the clergy does very much to unite the priest with the people, though we cannot enough regret the Oriental dress, the long beard, and flowing hair, which keep up a professional costume, separate the clergy from the commonalty, abridge freedom of intercourse, and continue the prejudice of caste, as if they were indeed mediators, as they are termed. But there is no doubt of the public attachment to the existing Church; even that sonorous snivel, so often accompanied with a clerical smile, is received with profoundest reverence. And the Church itself is regarded as the bond of national union. "*Notre religion est personification de notre nationalité,*" says Saripolos. It has identified itself with the holy cause of freedom: it has even marched in the van of the army of martyrs. The venerable Patriarch of Constantinople, with three bishops and eight priests, were the earliest victims of the Revolution, being executed without trial, and upon mere suspicion, immediately after high mass, and with every circumstance of indignity. The Archbishop of Patræ became one of the popular leaders in the war of independence, and the clergy as a body distinguished themselves as patriots, participated in the hardships and shared the peril of that fearful year, 1821. A Church thus identified with the noblest struggle for national existence since our own, — a Church adorned with purity of life and humility of bearing, — can hope everything from the affections of its subjects. A far-seeing government would, we think, confer more power on a body of men, as remote as possible from ambition, and ever true to national interests; but especially would educate the sadly ignorant priesthood,* lighten the load of ceremony, more oppressive than

* Dr. King gives rather a rich anecdote of the degraded state of the Russian clergy. At the end of Lent the priest goes round from house to house

in any part of Christendom, supplant the mechanical drone by the Latin chant, — provided that no better approach can be made to an intelligent, improving, congregational offering.

Writers of the English Church make the contrast between the Eastern and Western Churches as marked as possible; Waddington even considers the Greek “a half-way house” from Oxford to Rome: he exults in the fact, that the Patriarch, from his dependent position, and the clergy, from their general poverty, can hardly become ambitious, — are likely to take part in any popular movement, — and, as it seems to us, if fairly persuaded that their own intellectual culture would vastly accelerate the elevation of their country, would not be content with being mere organ-grinders of a ritual nowise imposing, graceful, improving, or profitable, but would by their own adaptation to these enlightened times strike a note that would be felt to the remotest bounds of Grecian Christendom.

And now to answer in a few words the natural question, “What is to be done with Greece in the present crisis?” The most wholesome advice is the easiest to be reduced to practice. It is high time that she was let alone; that no more *faineant* kings, no more French constitutions, no more Russian insurrections, should be imposed upon her. She has been cheated, insulted, crushed, misguided, long enough. Individuals have made generous offerings at her classic shrine, but foreign governments have behaved infamously towards this long-suffering sister, have curtailed her proper proportions, wrenched from her grasp the fairest islands, suppressed the natural uprisings against the remaining Turkish thralldom, and vilified her name before the world. Under the pretence of preserving the Ottoman power, an Anglo-French in-

giving a benediction, which protects the family from the bad effects of too eager feeding after so much fasting. One poor fellow failed of receiving his blessing, because of some difficulty with his parish priest; but, rather than lose the grand surfeit, such a present was carried to his reverence as induced him to come to terms with the offender. Still the distance was such as to preclude a clerical visit; but the priest got over this difficulty by saying a prayer into the peasant's cap, and ordering him to carry it safe into his house, and there open it to each of the four corners, adding to it a personal benediction.

vation has very lately extinguished the watch-lights of freedom in her oppressed North.

First of all, then, she deserves, as she demands, to be let alone, that she may develop her own resources, unfold a national character, become a self-governed, self-consistent nationality.

And, as these meddlesome "high powers" leave a soil where they have no more business than upon our own, we would have them administer such a lesson to the man of straw they have seated on her young throne as even he cannot forget, — warning him that some nobler use can be made of exhausted finances than political corruption, apprising him that the civilized world looks with amazement upon his utter incapacity, pointing his blind Bavarianism to those rich fields now as deserted as when the huzzas of the world ushered him to his Athenian throne. Had he been at all true to his enviable opportunity as the Moses of an emancipated people, had he understood any element of national prosperity or progress, not a doubt would remain as to the proper disposal of the vexed "Eastern Question." It would be felt that the original heirs of the soil, bound to it by every suffering, every memory, every hope, by literature as well as religion, were the only people deserving, or capable of succeeding to, the sceptre of the waning crescent in that gorgeous capital of their ancient empire; and

"That Greece should guard, by right divine,
The portals of the Eastern world."

F. W. H.

ART. VI.—NORTON'S TRANSLATION OF THE GOSPELS.*

IN a recent number of this journal,† we reviewed, from the sheets then in our possession, a posthumous work by the late Mr. Norton, on "The Internal Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels." We announced at the

* *A Translation of the Gospels. With Notes.* By ANDREWS NORTON. In Two Volumes. Vol. I. *The Text.* (pp. 443.) Vol. II. *Notes.* (pp. 565.) Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1855. 8vo.

† *Christian Examiner*, January, 1855.

same time that the press was performing its office upon the Translation of the Gospels, with Notes, which the same eminent scholar had left as the sacred legacy of a life of faithful toil, to be given to the world after his removal from it.

"Stat sua cuique dies; breve et irreparabile tempus
Omnibus est vitæ; sed famam extendere factis,
Hoc virtutis opus."

We must use the Roman *fama* and *virtus* in their noblest and purest sense if we would express by them this Christian scholar's aim and the moral qualities by which he sought to win its high reward. The two works now appear together. The Anniversary Week, which draws to this city the great company of Christian ministers, offered to them many attractive volumes published in season to meet the Pentecostal time; but we apprehend that none of the new books drew more wistful eyes than were turned upon the three volumes now before us. Upon their mechanical execution the most faithful skill of the type-founder, the paper-maker, and the printer has been bestowed, and they never spent their efforts upon a work more worthy of them. There is no impropriety in filling out the announcement made by the initial letters appended to an Editorial Note, and in informing our readers that Mr. Charles Eliot Norton, the only son of the author, and Mr. Ezra Abbot, Jr., both of them men of high culture and accurate scholarship, have superintended the publication of the volumes. We happen to know something of the diligent and conscientious pains which they have spent, by day and by night, for many months, in the work which addressed itself to them by the strongest appeals upon their loving and self-rewarding zeal. This fact must add emphasis to the remark which ought first to be uttered over these volumes, as the thought which suggests it will first present itself to the mind of every considerate reader. These volumes contain the results of the most cautious, deliberate, and mature study, and on every page they bear witness to that religious conviction of their author, that he who would write or publish his views upon a subject involving the sacred interests of man ought to devote his lifetime to the work of preparation, and avoid a hasty or

ill-considered utterance as an offence against the cause of truth. We know not how the language of rebuke could convey a sharper reproach upon those who despatch in a week, a month, or a year their essays or discourses upon the fundamentals of religion and revelation, than is offered in the fact that these volumes appear only *now*. Thousands of persons have died who had either heard of them as in preparation, or would have sought with avidity to peruse them; but so long as their author was able to learn more of truth, he shrunk from every needless and remediable imperfection in its utterance. It was consistent with the whole method of his task in his own life, that the fruits of it should be most cautiously and laboriously made public.

Mr. Norton was first appointed to an office of instruction in Cambridge in 1811. During the seven years that had intervened between that date and his completion of his own undergraduate course in the College, sacred studies had engaged his heart and mind. He was revising one of the Notes to his Translation of the Gospels when, in the summer of 1853, his long-enfeebled constitution yielded to the last assault of disease. He never had any other professional task than that of teaching, and his teaching was almost exclusively confined to Biblical literature, and thus we have in our hands a work which is the product of half a century of such scholarly zeal as there are but few to imitate, and as none can surpass. These new volumes abound in references to, and contain many extended quotations from, the previously published works of the author, which reach over a period of many years. A significant token of one of his most marked characteristics is observable in these citations of his own earlier words and opinions. We cannot call to mind any parallel case of such persistency in views once expressed. And even in cases in any degree similar, in which men who have uttered important conclusions on important subjects have been studious to preserve their self-consistency after an interval of years, there are generally some indications of a holding to a previous self-committal as a matter of pride, at the expense of candor. The caution and deliberation with which Mr. Norton formed his opinions, and the general moderation with which he ex-

pressed them, saved him from the necessity of modifying in latter years the opinions to which he had before committed himself. His thorough conscientiousness might have relieved such a necessity of all that is mortifying in taking back one's own words, but the same conscientiousness, felt at the right time, happily insured him against that trial of a scholar's pride. As he refers his readers now to the works which they had on their shelves from his pen, he has no need to make the difficult though honest avowals implied in such sentences as these: "Here I was wrong"; "This I wish to qualify"; or, "I have found reason to change an opinion once expressed by me." He was constantly reviewing his opinions; but those of them which he had uttered had been too carefully weighed to require revision.

The reader will at once be reminded that the volumes before him, while they present to him under their title a retranslation into English of the Text of the Gospels with Notes, involve equally the two other great themes of sacred criticism, — namely, a reconsideration of the evidences of the Christian religion, and an exposition of its doctrinal and didactic substance.

The most venturesome and dubious labor to which the pen of critic or scholar can be devoted is that of making a new version, in the English language, of the Four Gospels. The chances are nearly all against his meeting with even tolerable success, while his risks of offending, not only prejudices and predilections, but some things a great deal more strong and a great deal better than either, are fearfully hazardous. It is a task in which profound scholarship, genius, and piety will by no means insure a felicitous result, even though they are united in their choicest combination. There are so many standards by which the merits and the defects of such a work would be judged, as to justify the assertion, that they are in direct opposition at some most important points with each other, and therefore that it would be impossible to satisfy even the reasonable elements that would be allowed to enter into them. Good taste, religious jealousy, and the heart's strongest and fondest associations, would find materials for complaint and for regret on every page of a new version of the Four Gospels in our mother tongue. It used to be predicted, some

fifty years ago, that, before that period had passed, some one or more of the sects of Protestantism would favor the use in the pulpit of a new version of the Bible. There is less and less likelihood every year that the prediction will be fulfilled; there is a steadily increasing strength of conviction, that it will henceforward be quoted as a mere fancy, and be rejoiced over as a disarmed threat or a dispelled apprehension. We suppose that every theological student, who works with thoroughness and enthusiasm over the written oracles, regards it, in his years of pupilage, as the first necessity in his profession, that there should be a new version. He may even entertain the suggestion, that perhaps he is the person to supply the deficiency,—in preparing a manuscript, at least, for his own private use. We may err in this supposition, by generalizing into a rule the short-lived purposes which may have presented themselves to only a minority of Scripture students. But we have no misgivings as to the truth of a second supposition which we will advance, in intimating that, in nine cases out of ten, a Christian minister, after several years of service in his profession, will pronounce a new English version to be the least called for, the least desirable, and the least to be welcomed, of all the intellectual labors of man. Constant study and perusal do indeed keep before him the defects of our present version, and when he is reading from it in the pulpit, or selecting a text in his study, the wish may become quite familiar that this or that expression or phraseology might be changed. He has a feeling—probably a very strong and just one too—that the perplexities which weigh upon the minds of some hearers, aggravating a sceptical tendency and impeding the work of edification, are in large measure caused by some infelicities or inaccuracies of the Gospel text, and would be sensibly relieved by some very slight emendations. But this same constant study and use of the Scriptures works an effect on the minister's mind and feelings directly counter to that which would dispose him to favor any change. His riper age makes him tolerant of critical imperfections which his quicker sensitiveness in youth so readily apprehended. He becomes oblivious of the niceties of idiom, and the discordances evolved by the effort to construct a harmony. The later sermons of

a minister very seldom rely, for their point or power, upon a rectification of the language of their texts. The use of the Bible for devotional purposes always abates the zeal for any other mode of dealing with it. If a proposition were made in any quarter to change the version of the Bible now in use in the pulpits of English Protestant Christians, it would be met by a storm of objections. We do not mean to imply that all these objections would be reasonable, for some of them doubtless would be futile, and some essentially superstitious and fanciful. But if poor and inconclusive reasons were offered against the proposition, it would not be for lack of other reasons, which the wisest and the best would not shrink from urging.

Our readers must judge whether in this statement we have misrepresented the general opinion prevailing around us. We are mindful of the earnest advocacy with which some individuals have urged the vital importance of a revision of our English Bible. If a convention were called for effecting it, the object might be allowed to be worthy of the debates and the plans of the picked scholars of all Christendom, who would offer a most becoming tribunal, before which controversial issues might be discussed to the best purpose. We can indeed conceive that all the colleges of English Protestant Christians might be invited to send delegates to a convention, designed to sit for five years, weighing critically every proposed emendation of the text of the Bible. The assembly might be even in aspect more august, and would certainly be better warranted in its purpose, than that represented in Raphaël's fresco of the Dispute upon the Sacrament of the Real Presence. But we can conceive of no other agency than that of some such scholarly conclave, from all sects and parties, as ever promising to change our common English version of the Bible.

The reasons by which this strong attachment to our present version, and this strong repugnance to the substitution of another in its place, would vindicate themselves, if challenged, are, as we have intimated, many, and contain various degrees of the qualities which constitute a *reason* for or against anything. The general excellence of our own version has been admitted and even insisted upon by the vast majority of those who are

competent to pronounce an opinion on the matter. Alike for prevailing fidelity to the original text, for simplicity, terseness, dignity, tenderness, and force in its renderings, and for the Saxon element which gives it its character, the English Bible, taken as a whole, has received a sentence of approbation which can never be revoked. There was also something more than opportune and remarkable, there was something providential even, in that date in time — considered relatively to many other incidents and events — in which our version came into use. It was just in season to admit of its being brought by the English colonists to this New World, to be made here a bond in the idiom, as well as in the language, of mighty nations, for holding them in as close a relationship, in matters of religious belief and interest, as the conditions of the case will allow. Before the inhabitants of Britain had been sundered into the various sects still existing and multiplying there, and just as the rupture was about to take place, this version was “by royal authority appointed to be read in all churches.” This is the only edict of any monarch which successive generations of Christians have ever regarded, and it is the only one which redeems the name and the reign of James I. from absolute contempt. That our mother country should have given to her own children, about to be sundered into various communions of believers and worshippers, and to those who were about to exile themselves to plant the Gospel in the Western continent, this one common version of the Bible, and that this gift should have been bestowed at the only point of time in which it would have been accepted, may stand as the foremost reasons which warrant the prevailing attachment to it, and resist any substitute for it. And yet these are not the reasons which weigh most with those who are concerned in the matter. There are millions of Christians who are so far from being influenced by these reasons, that they do not even know of the facts on which they are based. Nor have we space for the statement of the other reasons, still less for discussing the degree of good *reason* which these other reasons may proceed upon in the minds and feelings of those who cherish our common English Bible. It is enough to say, that there are reasons given and allowed which warrant the assertion al-

ready advanced as to the venture run by any one who undertakes a new version of what is to us the most valuable portion of the Bible. There is no single sect or denomination of Christians, which, as a whole, would not indorse our statement, that the most venturesome undertaking in any province of critical scholarship is that of making a new version in the English language of the Four Gospels. This indorsement would consist in a simple refusal to give a new version the place, and the confidence, and the love, now given to what is in all our hands. It is a curious fact, which doubtless multitudes of persons have consciously verified, that, though we may not ourselves quote sentences of Scripture from memory with perfect verbal accuracy, we are generally well aware of, and most commonly are disagreeably affected by, any mistake which another person may make in such quotations. We might not be able to rectify the error; we might make blunders of our own in attempting to do so; but still, if a wrong or a misplaced word, be it but a little particle, falls upon our ear in the repetition of a cherished sentence or a sweet strain, we say, protestingly, "That is not exactly right." And then the familiar phrases and tenor of Scripture language have acquired for us tender associations which give them a charm, which exalt their meaning, and add very much to the utmost significance which grammar, or a dictionary, could possibly find in the words, or the closest interpretation could extract from the sentiment contained in them. There are a thousand little hiding-places and nooks in the words of Scripture, within which devotion has loved to find its sheltered retreats; where words and images, and mere fashionings of the breath or the accent, as they are meditated or uttered, bear us into depths, or lift us into heights, which the soul can reach only with just such aid. Thus it is that by an instinct equally strong and fond we shrink from all changes in such sentences of Scripture as have become charms and amulets and legendary memories to our hearts. Different sentences have won that sweet power, and are made to serve that holy use, to different persons. And this is precisely the secret sway by which the familiar version of the Bible holds all who love it most, and it is by this sensitive nerve within our hearts that we feel the pain started

by the suggestion of a change. The sentences of Scripture, its most cherished phrases and forms of speech, its choicest oracles for each heart, are stamped in that heart's tenderest memories; they sanctify its memories, and educate from them its hopes. They become rhythmical, vibrative to the inner ear; they are enshrined at the secret altar of meditation, conflict, and peace.

But we must check the current of our remarks in this direction. We have before us a new English version of the Four Gospels, and it has not been with a view of prejudicing its claims for a candid and grateful consideration of its own great merits, that we have thus cordially recognized the strength of the attachment cherished towards the same precious records in their old form. We find an easy point of transition from what we have said already, to what we have yet to say, in a suggestion that bears alike upon the common version and upon any one that may be offered from a competent source as an improvement upon it. The suggestion has doubtless been anticipated by the reader, who may have yielded only a qualified assent to our statements concerning the prevailing estimate of the common version. The strength of the feeling which clings to it as it is, and would object to any changes in it, will be accounted to the law of association, and the suggestion will follow, that, when this feeling is analyzed, it will prove to be only one form of our bondage to the letter. Then we must confront the question, whether, supposing our version contains acknowledged errors, or needs emendation, simply that it may better serve the interests of Christian truth, we ought for one moment to hesitate as to our acceptance of the results of a faithful scholar's critical labors? Associations with the letter of Scripture, however precious and tender, fulfil their highest office for good only when they help to communicate, to impress, and to make effective the sacred truths which are committed to the written record; they certainly must not be allowed to serve as substitutes for something better than themselves, still less to aid in the support of injurious prejudices and obnoxious errors. The Bible is the very last book in which errors, introduced by the ignorance or carelessness of man, and admitting of correction by his progress in knowledge, ought to be allowed to stand un-

challenged and unaltered. A book which holds the place yielded by the wise and good to the sacred volume,—a book which serves such holy uses, and to which are intrusted such momentous interests,—should lack no help which human wit or skill can give it, in allowing it to address each one in “his own mother tongue,” with as rigid a fidelity to the original text as the art of translation can secure. We had better submit to a wrenching of our fondest associations, than be parties to any blending of true faith with mere delusion in such a matter.

This suggestion will of course be admitted by all intelligent persons, as perfectly reasonable in the abstract, but it will be questioned by many, and will be denied by a few, as having any application of real importance to our common translation of the Scriptures. It will be alleged, that, even if the version does contain grammatical, idiomatic, or textual inaccuracies, these are very trivial, and do not in any way peril the interest of an intelligent and edifying use of Scripture. Now we certainly are not concerned to make out a case designed to confute this assertion, though we have a strong conviction of our own that infidelity, and a false theology, and an erroneous and a prejudicial view of the evidences and the substance of revelation, are more or less served by some imperfections in our common version of the Bible. Mr. Norton, a man whose judgment in this matter deserves as much regard as that of any other individual who has ever pronounced upon it, has emphatically declared his own conviction, that errors in our common version, and erroneous views of the sources, the authority, and the contents of the original texts, are the chief sources of scepticism, modern superstition, false theology, and prevailing misconceptions about religion.

But the suggestion we have advanced is by no means restricted, in its bearing upon the question of new versions, to the condition that very manifest and very harmful errors should be indicated in our present version. The power of the associations connected by heart and mind with the familiar text has fastened upon some sentences, which in their phraseology or turn of expression may for various reasons convey wrong impressions, or fail to communicate the meaning of their writers, or any meaning at all. Take, for instance, some of the words and

phrases on which prevailing views, having a bearing upon the evidences, the doctrines, and the precepts of revelation, have a most vital dependence, and see how important grammatical and etymological accuracy, and idiomatic construction, and all the elements of textual criticism, become, on account of the extreme interest committed to such words in their single signification or their place in a phrase or a sentence. We read of "the day of judgment," and the question at once arises, if Christian doctrine, as taught from an authoritative source, is committed to an announcement conformed to a popular conception, that *one day* has been designated in the lapse of distant ages in which God shall summon all the risen dead before his tribunal to receive their everlasting allotments. It is for the critical scholar to tell us whether this is the fair implication of the original text, or whether an equally correct, or rather a more correct, construction is put upon the words, by regarding them as referring to *a* day, any day, each present and passing day, as exhibiting a continuous process of divine retribution.

Again, we read that "All manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men; but the blasphemy against the Holy Ghost shall not be forgiven unto men." How serious a matter it thus becomes with us to define with rigid exactness the nature of that one single sin, which is thus alone exempted from the compass of God's pardoning mercy. The meaning of a word, or of two or three words, must decide that issue. We remember having held an interview with an estimable woman, who was laboring under very deep depression in the form of religious melancholy, in the course of which she said that she was guilty of the unpardonable sin against the Holy Ghost. With all the sincerity and earnestness of sympathy which we could express, we signified our sorrow that she should feel her conscience burdened with such a sin. We added, that we could never fully satisfy ourselves as to the nature of that sin, and that, as there had been so many opinions as to what constituted it, we should be instructed in the sad secret if she would tell us precisely what the sin of which she accused herself was. She made an attempt to do so, but failing to satisfy her own idea in her words, her conscience seemed

to get relief from the burden, and she never afterwards charged herself with the sin. Another issue arises where we read that this sin shall be forgiven "neither in this world, neither in the world to come." The popular belief, drawn from these words, supposes them to refer to this life and the life to come. Criticism has to arbitrate between this construction and that which interprets them as referring to "this age," or existing dispensation, viz. the Jewish, and the age or dispensation to come, viz. the Christian.

When the Saviour is interpreted as saying, that "many are called, but few are chosen," the majority of readers understand him as affirming that the Gospel makes a large and free offer of its great salvation, and yet that few will finally be found to have so complied with its terms as to receive its gift. The same original words, as construed by Mr. Norton, are made to convey a very general, almost a proverbial announcement, so vague and pointless as to startle no one, — thus: "The invited are many, but the selected are few."

We might multiply illustrations of the weight of significance committed to the familiar words and phrases of our common version of the Gospels, for the purpose of showing how vital is the importance of extreme accuracy in such matters, either as they bear upon the evidences, or involve the doctrinal substance, of the Christian religion. The word *saved* might be allowed to stand as the most signal example of the momentous questions committed to its various interpretations, as embracing relief from a bodily infliction, a recovery from disease, an escape from death, a pardon for sin, and a security against the woe and an assurance of the bliss of the life to come. Such illustrations could hardly be pursued so as to exhaust the material of them in the Gospels alone. But whether we present to ourselves few or many of them, they will give us a profound impression of the momentous importance of accuracy in rendering words to which superstition and ignorance, as well as intelligent faith and piety, must look and do look for their conceptions of God and of God's will and truth as served by the records of a revelation.

We are often told, that our translation of the Bible forms a standard for verbal and grammatical usage for

our language, and is also a security against any changes in our mother tongue. There is a degree of truth in the saying, but by no means entire truth in it. Some words used in our modern speech and literature are used with a very different sense from that which attaches to them in the Bible. Thus, the word *prevent* is there used, according to its Latin etymology, in the sense of *anticipating* or *getting the start of*: with us it never has that signification, but means *to obstruct* or *to oppose*. The verb *to let* has completely reversed its meaning, as in the Bible it means *to oppose*, and in our speech *to permit*. The word *atonement* is a striking example of the change which a false doctrine will introduce in the signification of a Scripture word. The word *election* always refers in the New Testament to the call of a *class*, or *nation*, or *race* of *people*, to the enjoyment of privileges in *this* world, in *this* life. It never refers to the selection of *individuals* for salvation in *another* life. These two perversions have attached to the word by its abuse in doctrinal controversy. Noah Webster has given the word this perverted signification as one of its proper definitions, and now those who trust to his Dictionary will transfer from it to the New Testament a wrong meaning of the word. If therefore our common speech will not hold itself bound to conform to the Bible signification of words, the alternative seems to be, that the words of the Bible must, from time to time, be changed to conform them to the modifications in our language, if we would not lead untaught readers into error.

There are many words which are obsolete, except as they are preserved in use by the Bible. There are many other words into which meanings have been stereotyped that do not belong to them. And there are still other words and several phrases which have become incrustated with associations either prejudicial to the clearness, the assurance, and the enjoyment of a true Christian faith, or used in the service of bigotry and misconception. These certainly are not to be regarded as among the *offences* which "must come." The translators of our common version were not inspired of God, but were guided by their human learning, obtained as we obtain our own. They had no prerogative which authorized them to fix unchangeably in the English tongue, subject

as it must be in itself to constant fluctuations in its vocabulary, the meaning of the words of another tongue; still less had these translators a right to make their judgment the arbitrator in matters open to widely different decisions. We would yield the utmost to a claim, strongly enough, perhaps too strongly, enforced by our own feelings, in behalf of the familiar language of our common version. We will not forget a single sentence of all our literature whose truth or beauty is committed to the crystallized phraseology of that version; we will not destroy the rhythm of a single lyric whose melody or glow is caught from a cherished Scripture text. But we must reiterate the assertion, that accuracy is the paramount recommendation of a version. The great question with us must always be, Does the page, does the sentence before us, present with the utmost exactness which honest and able scholarship can insure, the original words from which we must derive our knowledge and our views of the Gospel? The tenacity with which our common version of the Scriptures is cherished, is significant to many thoughtful minds of a mere idolatry of the letter, which is in itself so prolific a source of controversy, and such a leaden weight upon every effort to harmonize dogmatic strifes, that some persons will advocate a succession of new versions, if only for the purpose of breaking this oppressive spell. Sit down to argue with a friend of another creed some controverted point of faith or doctrine, and he will quote you a text. Perhaps the very emphasis which he gives to the whole text, or even to a word in it, may attach to it on grounds wholly distinct from, and even in opposition to, its real meaning. He may be relying not at all upon a sentiment or an assertion expressed by an Apostle, but upon the meaning and the construction which have been put upon the Scripture words during the long uses of controversy. You may at once discern the bias in his mind, resulting from the bias which has perverted the text, and you will hardly avoid yielding to a degree of disappointment that all fair and unprejudiced discussion is precluded, because the field is so obstructed by the rubbish of all former conflicts. And yet our trials of this sort are not peculiar to this generation, nor wholly unlike those which the first generation of Christians had

to meet. A large part of the whole work of controversy has always been given to the adjustment of terms in use before the issue was opened; and when the Saviour and his Apostles preached, they used technical words and phrases which had previously imbedded themselves in Jewish obstinacy as having a meaning that was not to be trifled with or changed.

We have thus made what we conceive to be a fair statement of the nature and strength of the attachment by which our common version of the Gospels holds the hearts of Christians, and we have offered certainly an unexaggerated plea in justification of the most painstaking efforts to insure greater accuracy in our version, even if the process require a rending of the most cherished associations. According as any one realizes the occasion for changing the phraseology or renderings of our common version, will he approve in the abstract of the purpose of a competent scholar who should take the work in hand; and by the same arbitration will the merits of a new version be pronounced upon. Two conditions will probably be urged as of paramount importance by the majority of intelligent persons; first, that not the slightest verbal change should be made in the English version that was not absolutely demanded for the sake of correcting an error, or relieving a real obscurity, or substituting a full meaning for an imperfect one; and second, that every word, phrase, and sentence substituted for those now read by us should stand either upon the necessity of the case, or should render actual service towards the better expression of the very mind and meaning of the original writer.

We are prepared now to make a brief review of the contents of the two volumes before us. Far be it from us to deal carelessly with these fruits of sacred labor, patiently pursued through a lifetime. We would take modesty and gratitude as our guides, while not forgetful of the claims of the Word whose English echoes we are to criticise.

For reasons which Mr. Norton had set forth in a very elaborate note in his previous great work on the Gospels, he regards the following passages in our received text as of doubtful genuineness, viz. the first two chapters of Matthew, as also chap. xxvii. 3-10; part of the 52d and

the 53d verse of the same chapter; Mark xvi. 9-20; Luke xxii. 43, 44; John v. 3, 4; vii. 53 to viii. 11; and xxi. 24, 25. The Preliminary or Appended Notes contain the extracts from his other writings which give the grounds on which each of these passages, whose genuineness is disputed, is regarded as an interpolation. The Notes also contain Mr. Norton's views upon the various readings, the correspondences among the first three Gospels, and the difference between them and the Gospel of John. Mr. Norton rejects that complicated and unsatisfactory theory of a "Common Document" or "Original Gospel" to which recourse has been had for explaining certain phenomena presented by the works of the first three Evangelists. He assigns A. D. 60 as the proximate date of the composition of the last-named writings. Matthew and John are to be taken as speaking from their own personal knowledge and observation as companions of Jesus, while Mark and Luke are indirect or secondary authorities. Through force of reasons, the value of which can be estimated only by a very careful criticism, Mr. Norton concludes that Mark and Luke were not well acquainted with the chronological order of the events of the Gospel history, and are generally or always wrong when they differ in arrangement from Matthew. We quote an emphatic sentence, which ought to be borne in mind by the reader of Mr. Norton's volumes, for the sake both of its positive assertion and of its qualifying allowance.

"As regards the Apostles, we believe that their minds were enlightened by the Spirit of God, and by direct miraculous communications from Him in regard to the essential truths of Christianity. But we have no warrant to believe, nor is there any probable argument to show, that this divine illumination was further extended."—Vol. II. p. 549.

The first impression which we believe every candid and well-informed reader will receive, as he peruses this new version of the Gospels, will be that derived from the perfect purity of taste which so eminently distinguishes it. Such a reader will take a grateful pleasure in yielding to this impression, and in announcing it. Matters of taste are vital in such a work as this. In no use to which human language is put do we so positively demand the exact medium between the extremes of all

possible risks and faults, as in a version of the Gospels. A stilted grandiloquence and a homely simplicity, swollen phrases and curt laconics, rhetorical adornments and severe literalisms, conventional vulgarisms and pedantic terms of expression, would be equally and painfully offensive. We have read no English from the pen of any writer which in grace, intelligibleness, accuracy, and adaptation to its theme, surpasses that of Mr. Norton. His taste is faultless. There is not a line, a phrase, a word, in these pages, which offends because of a shock or wound to the most sensitive ear or the most delicate reserve of reverence. Whatever criticism may be passed upon the version on the score of its exegetical or devotional faults, in the view of those whose cherished associations or belief it may handle harshly, we venture to affirm that it will escape all censure from the most fastidious purist in language. How difficult of attainment this excellence is, only a well-trained mind can fully appreciate, while any signal exhibition of a lack of it would be apparent even to the uncultivated. The Saxon element of our language prevails through the version. No ambitious effort, no study of effect, no conceit, no triviality of expression, no involved sentence, presents itself on a single page. Of course, any reader on whose memory the familiar language of our received text was stamped in childhood, any one who has our text, as we say, "by heart," will at once be sensible of a greater or a lesser disturbance of sensibilities as he scans these pages. But it is the first shock that is disagreeable. As he reads on, he will often be conscious of a keen satisfaction. As when we turn the diamond in the light new gleams of radiant beauty sparkle from its crystal points, so will slight changes in the form of expression or the rendering of a Scripture text leave in our hands the same gem that we had before, and multiply the beams that ray out from it. We might quote many sentences from this version which would be welcomed by some readers as having for the first time an intelligible meaning to them, and which would also be admitted by the best skilled interpreters of Scripture to relieve an obscurity, to draw out the significance, and to intensify the truth now recognized in one or another passage. And we should withhold the full acknowledgment of our own gratified

heart and mind, if we did not add that the fitness, and the purity, and the fidelity of language which mark this version are most strikingly apparent in the rendering of the passages attributed to the Saviour. He still speaks in this version as in the ears of those sent to entrap him,—as never man spake before.

Another very striking characteristic of Mr. Norton's version is its entire freedom from all the ghostly, mistifying, and shadowy elements with which the majority of Biblical interpreters have invested their renderings of the Scripture text. Never were sacred oracles uttered in a less oracular strain than are these, in the language in which Mr. Norton presents them. In no instance does he avail himself of those adumbrating, foggy, or vague terms of expression which are so often used in religious discourse to exaggerate a sentiment or to becloud the mind of a reader. The volumes before us make the Evangelists speak to us always in the legitimate and appropriate tones of an historic narrative, a didactic address, or a spiritual appeal. It is astonishing to note the effect of the perusal of the new version under this one single point of view, as it so completely divests the Gospel records of all sacerdotalism, all ecclesiasticism. We receive from it an amazingly clear impression of the directness, the simplicity, the frankness, and the calm confidence of assertion with which the Saviour announced his own truths, and the Evangelists reported his words with their own illustrative comments. A translation must necessarily convey, in the words used to represent the original, more or less of the mere inferences of the translator as to what was the meaning of the writer, where his words are ambiguous or admit of wide latitude in their construction. The translator must, in such cases, fix the meaning, and, besides using all the liberty allowed or required for idiomatic constructions, he must in some cases make his own judgment the arbitrator between diverse interpretations. In a hundred passages in our common version, the critical and well-informed student can indicate how the rendering of ambiguous words or phrases has been decided on grounds not exclusively of grammar or philology, but through the direction of the sympathies and predilections of the old translators. But these inferences of the translator must

never be allowed to pass into comments. There are cases in which they do so in our own version, and with this fact in our minds we have the more carefully studied Mr. Norton's method to see if he had ever been induced to add to or incorporate with his version of what the original asserts, his opinion as to what the writers intended to say, and as to whether what they do say is correct and good. We find no instance of this expository matter, or of anything like a gloss or a comment of a sort to displease us, though he has several verbal constructions which we may hesitate to receive. Least of all has Mr. Norton, so far as we can judge, ever made doubtful or controverted texts to turn to the support of his cherished opinions of Christian doctrine. He held such religious or doctrinal views as he was always ready to defend, because he believed them to be taught in the Gospels; but he has not put those views into the record by any forcing or disingenuous processes, because he had an opportunity to do so in the work of retranslation. On the contrary, he has exercised a stern impartiality in the case, aiming only for rigid exactness. He has denied himself the liberty that must often have tempted him to gloss or qualify a passage in which the original or the common version may seem not easily reconcilable with truth, reason, or the ends of controversy to which he is a party on a side he was always glad to serve. How many who have had to read from pulpits the literally unreasonable statement of the Savior's assertion, "from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath," (Matthew xxv. 29,) have wished that the original had been made by a gloss in our version to affirm, as the passage in spirit does signify, "from him who does not improve or put to a good use what he has, it shall be taken away." Mr. Norton would doubtless have been pardoned if he had made the change. But he does not make it. His version of the passage reads, "from him who has not, even what he has shall be taken." Neither does he attempt to soften the seeming abruptness of the Saviour's address to his mother, "Woman, what have I to do with thee?" which he renders thus: "Woman, why do you trouble me?" He leaves the text still harsh to our ears, and deals with it in his Notes only. The most ardent cham-

pion of the Papacy can find no fault with Mr. Norton's rendering of the great text urged in support of the primacy of St. Peter, for the version before us reads more favorably for that claim than does our own version, thus: "And I in return say to you, that you are, as I have named you, a Rock, and on this rock will I build my church," &c. (Matthew xvi. 18.)

One more general remark suggests itself to us as demanding expression. As we completed our first perusal of this new version of the Gospels with the accompanying Notes, the thought presented itself to our minds that the volumes would be subjected to a vast amount of incompetent criticism from incompetent men. Where one real scholar, furnished with the large attainments and the generosity of mind and the expansiveness of judgment won by true culture, subjects the contents of the volumes to his fair tests, ten or a hundred chance critics will pick a sentence here and there as material for their raillery, their censure, or their dogmatism. Nobody, however, will witness any experimental results of this sort of a more offensive or censurable character than Mr. Norton had learned to recognize, as entering into the melancholy conditions by which the disciple of truth is compelled to run the gauntlet of prejudice and passion. He cared as little for the sciolists and the scarecrows of criticism as any man who ever lived. He was not in the habit of wasting compliments upon any of this tribe, nor did he deprecate their censures. It requires but little skill in the interpretation of mild words wrought out into stinging sentences, to enable such critics and dogmatists to learn from various deliberate utterances of Mr. Norton what was his candid opinion of them and their methods. He wished them all well as sharers of humanity, but his sober opinion of them was not flattering. Some of these will make sad work with his great posthumous publication. Men, whose memories retain only a tattered remnant of their college Greek, will turn over their lexicons, and flaunt at many of Mr. Norton's renderings. Fairer critics may doubtless find material for offence and for objection. Now we must utter our suggestion. Let these volumes be received and treated with the respect due to the results of the study of a lifetime; rare study too, begun and pursued with an entireness of

devotion, a persistency of purpose, an unwearied and exhaustive application, a completeness of apparatus, a cautious hesitancy in coming to a conclusion, a constant and reiterated reviewal, step by step, of the materials and elements which make up the perplexities and decide the value of truth, and, beside all these high terms, a conscientiousness, a loyalty to rectitude, and a sense of responsibility, which dignified Mr. Norton as a model Christian scholar. Of such a man, and of such studies, the volumes before us are the legacy and the results.

Without attempting any elaborate or methodical criticism of this great work, we will venture to select for cursory remark a few passages, phrases, or words, which present Mr. Norton's version as more or less different from our own; and as we rapidly turn over his pages for this purpose, we will note now and then anything distinctive, peculiar, or emphatic in its bearing upon matters of evidence or doctrine.

The word, in the preaching of John the Baptist, which in our version is rendered "Repent ye," and in the Roman Catholic version "Do penance," is by Mr. Norton rendered "Reform." We do not like the change, and though we apprehend the force of the reason by which it is justified in the note on the passage, it does not overcome our objection. The reason given for the substitution of *reform* is, that the primary idea expressed by the word is a change from a bad moral state to a good one, while that expressed by *repentance* is merely sorrow for one's past conduct; and John was insisting upon the necessity of the change, rather than upon the feeling connected with it. But should it not be considered that this is a case in which usage and association have overruled etymology? *Repentance* has become a religious, an evangelical word for expressing both the change and the agency of the change which lies at the basis of a renewed life. In popular use, *repentance* means something more and better, something deeper and more thorough, than *reformation*, and in fact includes reformation. Reformation is an effect, a result; repentance is the instigating impulse, or cause of it, and is held not to exist or be at work unless the effect—reformation—follows it. Is not *repent*, therefore, the more appropri-

ately religious word to put into the mouth of the Baptist, because it embraces both the inwardly operating agency—the heart-work which is distinctive of the Gospel—and the outward evidence of its reality? The signification of repentance compared with that of reformation in our Christian vocabulary presents us with a point of difference similar to that between mining, or sub-soiling, and top-dressing, or garden-work. The former is the more thorough and the more deep, and acts from below up to the surface; the latter may be but show. And even as to strict etymology, the original word *μετάνοια* involves that radical *change* of *mind*, *motive*, *purpose*, *principle*, and *aim*, which passes with us for much more than an *alteration of a habit*, which is commonly expressed by *reformation*.

We have a similar objection to the verbal change by which the word "*acknowledging* their sins" is substituted for "*confessing* their sins" (Matt. iii. 6); the latter is the more religious and more penitential word, and therefore, we would modestly suggest, is preferable.

When, as in our version, the Saviour is represented as answering the objection of John to baptize him with the words, "Suffer it to be so now, for thus it becometh us to fulfil all righteousness," (Matt. iii. 15,) an intelligent reader feels that the passage is not fairly dealt by. If it conveys any meaning, it conveys too strong an implication in its meaning, and an unintelligent reader might draw from it the conclusion, that to be baptized is to fulfil all righteousness. The gloss which we have to give to the passage to extract its signification, is something of this sort: "Permit it to be so, for it is meet that we should thus respect and observe the religious form connected by faith and usage with a proselyting or converting work." Mr. Norton's rendering of the sentence is as follows: "Permit it now; for thus must we do to accomplish all that is right,"—as explained in the note, "in order to the effectual performance of your office and mine."

The reader will notice that Mr. Norton substitutes through his translation *you* and *your*, for *thou* and *thee* and *thy*, and frequently *will* for *shall* in the future tense of verbs. There will be much difference of opinion as to the grounds of these changes, their expediency, feli-

city, and general effect, but we have not space for entertaining the question.

There is a long and an exceedingly interesting note upon the account of the Temptation in the wilderness, covering twenty-four pages with as able a piece of scholarly criticism as was ever devoted to that subject. Mr. Norton states, examines, and rejects, successively, the theories which have treated the narrative as an allegory, a vision, and a myth. He regards it as an imperfectly related account of an imperfectly understood discourse or parable, addressed by the Saviour to the disciples, designed to show them how inconsistent were the Jewish expectations of the Messiah, and how wicked it would be for him to act in conformity with them.

Mr. Norton exercises his discretion, as every translator must do, in selecting English significations for the various uses of the forms of the verb σώζω, as the connections in which they are found imply the meaning of *a cure, a relief or deliverance from disease or peril*, or the higher blessing of salvation for the life to come.

Where the word occurs in Matthew ix. 22, our version reads, "Thy faith hath made thee whole": Mr. Norton's reads, "Your faith has made you well." Again, in Matthew x. 22, our version renders the original, "he that endureth to the end shall be saved": in the version before us it stands, "he who perseveres to the end will be blessed," and the renderings are respectively the same in chap. xxiv. 13. In the narrative of the ten lepers in Luke xvii., it is said that they were all cleansed, or cured, but the one who returned thanks for the blessing was addressed by the Saviour as follows, in our version, "Thy faith hath made thee whole." But if his faith and gratitude won for him any favor beyond that enjoyed by the other nine lepers, then the being made *whole* does not exhaust the signification of the original word. Mr. Norton's rendering is, "Your faith has saved you." In John v. 34, he accords with the common version in using the term "saved." When we call to mind the fact that the variances which divide Christians upon matters of doctrinal belief suspend issues of immeasurable importance upon the signification of emphatic words, we shall appreciate the value of such labors as those to which Mr. Norton devoted his life.

A careful comparison of the phraseology of his version with that of our own will deliver a reader from the bondage of literalism, and will assure him that the power of Christian truth and the destiny of immortal souls are not committed to the meaning of words.

A verbal change greatly for the better is made in the sentences of Matthew v. 29, 30. "If thy right eye offend thee," — "if thy right hand offend thee." In the text before us they read, "If, then, your right eye be leading you into sin," &c.

The verse which in our text reads (Matt. xi. 22), "It shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon, at the day of judgment, than for you," — gives place to the following: "But I say to you, that, when sentence is passed, it will be less tolerable for you than it was for Tyre and Sidon." Though Mr. Norton departs from the Greek syntax in this rendering, it is obvious that the sense of the passage requires the idiomatic change. Our version represents Tyre and Sidon as yet awaiting judgment on a set day, when the guilt of those cities would be compared with that of Jerusalem. But sentence had already been passed upon Tyre and Sidon, and the Jews were warned that, when judgment should come upon their city, it would be more severe. The same change in the construction had been made by the author in rendering Matthew x. 15, which, as our version gives it, seems to imply that Sodom and Gomorrah were then still in existence awaiting judgment.

Our version of Matthew xii. 36 reads thus: "But I say unto you, that every idle word that men shall speak, they shall give account thereof in the day of judgment." Here again a set day is appointed for deciding retribution. But there is no article limiting the word for *day* in the original. Mr. Norton substitutes, "But I say to you, that for every vile word which men speak, they will give account in a day of judgment." A question of accuracy or of fitness may be raised as to our author's substitution of "calumny against the Spirit of God," for "blasphemy against the Holy Ghost" (Matt. xii. 31). He makes the same change in rendering the original word in chap. xv. 19, but he retains "blasphemy" in translating the verb of the same signification as the noun, in chap. xxvi. 65.

The rendering of Matthew xiii. 14, is improved by giving the force of the composite particle *áva*,—"by them is fulfilled *anew* the prophecy," &c.

In v. 39 of the same chapter, Mr. Norton substitutes, "The harvest is the end of present things," i. e. of this Jewish dispensation, for "the end of the world." In v. 56, "sisters" of Jesus gives place to "kinswomen." Instead of the expressions "to understand with their heart" (Matt. xiii. 15), and "their heart is far from me" (xv. 8), Mr. Norton offers us, "to understand with their minds," and "their minds are far from me."

The felicity in the choice of words, phrases, and turns of expression, which eminently characterizes this version, does not strike us as equally manifest in substituting for the words, "O thou of little faith!" the exclamation, "Distrustful man!" nor in the rendering of Matthew xvi. 23 thus: "But he, turning to Peter, said, Go from my sight, thou the Enemy! thou wouldst cause me to fall; for thou carest not for the purposes of God, but for what men desire." Though this phraseology does not come as close to the literal construction of the original as does that in our version, the change in sense is immaterial, but still the rendering does not please our ears. In verse 26, the sense of the original is admirably brought out where it is obscured in our version: "What advantage would it be to a man, to gain the whole world with the loss of his life? And what is there that a man will not give to purchase his life?" In verse 28, for "see the Son of Man coming in his kingdom," Mr. Norton reads, "see the Son of Man entering on his reign." In translating chap. xviii. 17, our author avoids the perplexity of a reference to "the Church" before there was such an institution, by reading, "tell the matter to your whole body assembled," that body of disciples afterwards becoming the Christian Church.

By giving a somewhat doubtful construction to the verb *χωρεῖν*, in Matthew xix. 12, Mr. Norton renders the sentence which in our version stands, "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it," thus: "Let him who is able to abstain from marriage, abstain."

If the reader will turn to Luke xvi., and read the first

nine verses, comparing Mr. Norton's translation with our common version, he will have a very striking and beautiful example of the way in which our author relieves the perplexities that have so long been associated with some vagueness of language in the Scriptures. The subject-matter to which we refer is the parable of the unjust steward. Very many readers are confounded and annoyed by that parable, as given in our version, because it draws no distinction between "the lord" of the steward and "the Lord" whom we serve, and does not distinctly emphasize the quality or trait in the steward which was commended. Some readers seem determined to infer that Christ applauded knavery in that parable. Mr. Norton brings out its simple meaning with great directness and skill.

As an instance of the very serious effects upon our cherished associations with Scripture language which are wrought by verbal changes in rendering an important sentence, let us compare the translation of Luke xvii. 5, in our version, with that of Mr. Norton. "And the Apostles said unto the Lord, Increase our faith." How many sermons have been preached upon that text, all proceeding upon, and, of course, helping to confirm the almost universal view of its meaning which interprets it thus: "O Thou who hast power over our spirits, help us more confidently to believe; make us more receptive of thine illuminating lessons; increase and deepen our spiritual life!" Our version presents the text to us as conveying an intense and yearning request from the disciples to their Master, that he would excite and strengthen within them the capacity for believing. Such are our associations with the verse, fixed by the phraseology with which we are so familiar, and confirmed by the devotional uses made of it in religious discourse. Mr. Norton translates the passage thus: "And the Apostles said to the Master, Give us stronger assurance"; which means, instead of the fervent petition for a spiritual gift, as above interpreted, something like this: "Furnish us with fuller proof, with more evidence of the truth of what you say; confirm our confidence by offering us better testimony." The note in which Mr. Norton gives the reasons for his rendering hardly reconciles us to the change, though we may be prejudiced against the force of his argument by

our associations with the passage. The important part of the sentence in the original is *Πρόσθετε ἡμῖν πίστιν*. We grant that the Greek verb and the noun, owing to the vague and indiscriminate sense in which, like most other elements of language, they are used, will not enable us to decide dogmatically upon their signification, and that we must depend for help on the context. But whatever be the right construction,—our object in selecting the passage not being to argue for either meaning,—the example may serve to remind us of the immense amount of associated religious conception and feeling, over and beyond what a grammatical interpretation may warrant, some of the more pregnant sentences of the Scriptures carry with them for us.

Among those who may bring an appreciating criticism to bear upon Mr. Norton's volumes, the materials for the greatest diversity of judgment as to the value of some of his decisions will probably be found in his version of the Gospel of John. There are so many technical words, idiomatic phrases, and oracular sentences in that composition, and the spirituality of its conceptions and imagery is so remote from our common thoughts, that the most acute criticism is often baffled in dealing with it. A reader of it must first be sure that he catches the meaning of the Evangelist, and then, if the furnishings of his mind and his gifts of speech are not of the very richest, he will find the utmost difficulty in interpreting that meaning in other language. Mr. Norton introduces his comments upon this Gospel by a most elaborate note upon the meaning of the Logos, taken from his "Statement of Reasons," &c. In the fourth verse of the first chapter of the original we first meet that word *ζωή*, which evidently carries with it a great weight of meaning in Christian doctrine. Trench, in his "Synonymes of the New Testament," brings the word into comparison with *bios*, in order to define to each the higher or the lower share of the full definition of the word *life* used by us to translate both of them. We compound one of the words to express the science of "biology" and the art of "biography," and we compound the other to express the science of "zoölogy." Schleusner does not give us much aid in distinguishing the more delicate, or even the etymological, significations of *ζωή* and *bios*.

In the first instance of the use of the word ζωή in John, Mr. Norton renders chap. i. ver. 4, "In him was the source of blessedness; and the source of blessedness was the light for man." John v. 26 he renders, "For as the Father is the fountain of life, so has he given to the Son to be the fountain of life." In translating the same word in chap. iii. 36, iv. 14, 36, v. 29, 40, and viii. 12, and in other places, the translator abides by our own version in using the word *life*. The discussion of the questions which might be raised on this point would be inviting, and might be made instructive, but we must forego it.

A closer adherence to the letter of the original than is maintained in our version leads Mr. Norton to give an admirable rendering to John v. 18, thus: "Then for this the Jews were more bent on killing him, because he had not only broken the Sabbath, but had also spoken of God as particularly his Father, putting himself on an equality with God." A similar change, greatly for the better, is made in translating verse 20: "For the Father loves the Son, and directs him in all that he does, and will direct him in greater works than these, to your astonishment."

We might fill our pages with comparisons involving some very serious issues, as the text in our version is set by the side of the renderings in the volume before us, or we might follow out this method by tracing the excellences of this new translation in some cases in which, by a very slight change of language, it either relieves a perplexity, or removes a misconception, or brightens an obscurity, or makes an unnoticed truth to gleam vividly upon us. Our readers will find delightful occupation in pursuing this course for themselves. We should add, that there is given, at the close of the first volume of the work, a table of various readings in the Greek text of the New Testament, as exhibited in the recensions of Griesbach, Scholz, Lachmann, and Tischendorf, so far as Mr. Norton adopts them in preference to that particular text which is the original of our common version.

In the discussions and expressions of opinion which come up incidentally in his Notes, Mr. Norton presents those multiplied tokens of personal knowledge, veracity, and candor on the part of the Evangelists which authenticate their records. He is also led to make such abate-

ments from the popular estimate of their infallibility and verbal accuracy, as must in his judgment be allowed in order to meet undeniable facts and to rescue the evidences of the Christian religion from being imperilled by unwarranted assumptions. Only when a reader has brought some degree of the same patient deliberation and studious scrutiny to the examination of the original Gospels, can he be in any measure prepared to pronounce upon Mr. Norton's decisions on these matters. His general and specific criticisms convey to us his views upon the distinguishing characteristics of the Gospels, as the mediums for transmitting truth of transcendent import from a divine source through vehicles partaking of ordinary human imperfections. For reasons which satisfied his own mind, and which he presents in plain and forcible terms to his intelligent readers, he yields the admission that the Gospels have not escaped corruption and occasional interpolation, and that they do not observe a strict chronological order, while in some slight matters of detail they are confused and inharmonious. By some delicate processes of inference and comparison he is led to conclusions like the following, namely, that in reporting the conversations of Jesus, Matthew is more to be relied on for verbal accuracy than is Luke,—conclusions which can be weighed only by processes like those through which they are reached.

Mr. Norton's volumes constitute what may be properly regarded as a monumental work. They represent a school of Biblical criticism, founded on a peculiar view of the sacred records and of the method of interpreting them, and brought to the exposition and support of a certain form of Christian belief. Though as a publication in the shape of a book this work bears the date of the current year in which it has passed from manuscript into print, the essential substance of its pages has for some years been familiar to a class of men among us who, as teachers and preachers, have been the mediums for communicating views received by them from Mr. Norton to a considerable number of persons. We have in our hands the most carefully and conscientiously matured results of the Biblical studies which Mr. Norton began some fifty years ago, and to which he devoted a life of singular consecration, zeal, and industry, in one

absorbing interest. It is now about forty years since classes of young men in the prime of their mental powers and with an enthusiasm for sacred studies, after having enjoyed the benefits of general intellectual culture, particularly in classical learning, began to gather around this most accomplished and painstaking interpreter of Scripture. The respect and confidence, the affection and deference, entertained and always manifested towards him by his pupils, find frequent rehearsal from their lips whenever they recall the period of their professional training. Without any immodest compliments upon our own Christian fellowship or denomination, we say only what, in this community at least, will be freely admitted, when we affirm that Mr. Norton's pupils knew that they were preparing themselves to be the religious instructors of as intelligent, serious, and thoughtful companies of men and women as were gathered in the churches of the land on the days of public worship. Though the assemblies of Liberal Christians, so called, embraced their full proportion of the worldly-minded, the indifferent, and the undevout, they received their character from quite another class of persons. The unbelief, the uneasiness, and the apathy which the preaching of a former century had fostered in the churches of New England, had given place to an intense interest, quickened by the Unitarian controversy. Young men from the country towns of New England who came to Boston with no other resources than their own energies, and who during the last half-century have furnished here so many noble specimens of Christian gentlemen, eminent in professional and mercantile success and as the donors and administrators of those splendid charities which are the pride of this community, were the first to feel the influence of a new interest awakened in religion. From the lips of more than one of the honored among the recent dead and of the venerable survivors of their generation we have heard the confession, that in their young years they had been completely alienated from all the religious views and doctrines under which they had been educated. A sterile and repulsive creed, a fictitious and ungenial piety, and a merely traditionary concern for religion, in vain sought to win them, and, failing to win them, had disgusted them, driving them into scepticism

or utter indifference. Much to their own amazement, at first, did they find themselves listening to a new dispensation of religious truths, till their whole souls were engaged in views that quickened and sanctified them. That generation has nearly vanished. How fruitful and beautiful was the Christian piety of many of its men and women! Very many persons were, at that time, asking with deep earnestness and anxiety to have the texts of Scripture cleared, if possible, from the misconstructions which their own instincts told them were utterly inconsistent with the Divine authority and the edifying influence that were claimed for them. The simple truth is that Biblical Criticism, using the phrase to express what is now included under all the historical, scientific, philological, archæological, and spiritual processes involved in it, — is comparatively quite a modern method of investigation. We cannot trace back its full and combined processes to even a complete century previous to the year in which we are living. There are commentaries, expositions of Scripture, and philological works extending back, in an almost unbroken series, to the age succeeding that of the Apostles. But if either one or any score of these be compared with an exegetical paper upon a single Scripture text in the *Bibliotheca Sacra*, for instance, we shall see what is now meant by the art of Biblical Criticism, and how very modern too the art is.

Mr. Norton can hardly be said to have originated and founded a new school of Scriptural exposition. Rules of interpretation which he recognizes, and canons of criticism which he applies as well to all the sacred writings as to particular texts or portions of them, are very frequently authenticated in his pages by references to authors who fill the whole space between us and the writers of the New Testament. But that he elaborated, developed, and gave the mark of his own individual and somewhat peculiar method of treating his chosen theme to even those views in which he accorded with others, and much more to those which he set forth on the grounds of his own scholarship and judgment, is a fact well known to his pupils. The pages before us will satisfy many readers that there are abundant reasons for attributing to Mr. Norton a characteristic method of criticism.

And now we have to meet a question which we confess that we approach with extreme diffidence, because it involves points of equal delicacy and importance. We should be glad to pass the question by if it did not stand so directly before us. Yet, lest our word should be misinterpreted, we ought to add that our reluctance to open the question is not from fear of the rebound that may follow from some admissions we may have to make, but because the question is so large, complicated, and momentous, as to require a fuller discussion than it can receive here. The question is this: Has the experimental trial which the pupils of Mr. Norton, and those whom they in their turn have taught, have made of his exegetical principles concerning Scripture as a whole, and of his more specific views and methods of dealing with important parts of it,—embracing the complete field of textual, doctrinal, and historical interpretation,—proved his general method to be satisfactory to one's own faith, and available for the Christian instruction of a new generation in the Church and the household? We might divide this question into many questions. Indeed, we should need to do that if we dealt with perfect thoroughness by all the elements which enter into it; but as we do not propose to go into details, we must seek to keep on the safe side by guarding and qualifying our language. Never having stood in the relation of pupil to Mr. Norton, except as a careful perusal of all his printed pages may indirectly have put us in the seat of the learner, we have no personal disclosures to make. Our opinions and inferences in reference to the question we have opened are drawn from our intercourse with our own brotherhood in belief, from the prevailing views expressed by our ministers and accepted through their publications, and from our own observation and study. We certainly have among us those who accept heartily and unreservedly Mr. Norton's critical canons, and the results of their application; who believe that he has set forth reasonable and sound principles, alike in authenticating the Apostolic writings, in qualifying the popular opinion as to their verbal inspiration, and in conceding something to their undeniable tokens of having suffered from the original imperfections of their authors and from the chances of time.

We feel warranted in asserting, that the very remarkable influence which Mr. Norton exercised amid the last generation of Liberal Christians has been an enduring influence, and is still greater than that which is to be traced to any other man. He was the scholar on our side of the Unitarian controversy, the ablest champion of our views on the field of Scriptural argument. He ought always to have the honors of this difficult and well-deserved distinction. Dr. Channing could not have done the work which Mr. Norton did. He could not have done his own work in this community without the help of Mr. Norton. So we affirm again that the prevailing influence exercised by Mr. Norton has been an abiding influence, gratefully recognized by his pupils and by their pupils. This general assertion may be subject to certain abatements in one or another case, in which those who adopt the leading views of this Scripture scholar may think him inconsistent with himself, or at fault in the interpretation of particular passages. It is equally true, that a few of the pupils of Mr. Norton, and some who have become acquainted indirectly with his views and interpretations of Scripture, have not been satisfied with them; and we suppose it would not be difficult to indicate some of his opinions and criticisms which many who accord with him in religious sentiment reject,—perhaps with considerable repugnance. The explanation of what we have thus written is, of course, to be found in the peculiar and marked characteristics of Mr. Norton's criticisms and expositions. They partake of a striking individuality of mental structure and culture. Most rigid are the exactions which he makes, at some times, for yielding his assent to what others have been content to receive on far less stringent terms; while, on occasions, he may hardly escape from the charge of opinionativeness in his statement of some criteria for judgment, and in his decision as to the amount of probability or testimony which may be sufficient to sustain a position or an inference. He had a philosophy, a scholarship, a standard of taste, a rule of discriminating, and a positiveness of affirming or denying, of accepting or rejecting, which, though in neither case bringing him into an isolated antagonism with other minds or other standards, did

certainly combine to give his conclusions the stamp of his own very distinctive philosophy of truth. No one can receive his conclusions who has not followed more or less methodically and continuously the processes by which he himself reached and ratified them.

But to whatever extent any among those who in general sympathize with the views accepted by Unitarians may dissent from Mr. Norton in his principles of Biblical criticism, or in his application of them in particular points relating to the history and meaning of the Gospel text, we apprehend that his pupils and readers have found the great difficulty to lie in this, — the going with him as far as he goes without going any farther. He is judged by them as a mediator between the old school of Biblical criticism, and the loose and ruinous principles of rationalism. He cuts away superstitions with a passionless, but a most unpitying, contempt of them; he rears the conservative safeguards of faith upon foundations that require much intelligence and judgment in the mind, as well as the spirit of piety in the heart, for their security. The school of criticism of which Mr. Norton is by far the ablest and the most consistent master offers itself to us, we will not say as a refuge, but as a strong-hold, for an intelligent faith to occupy between the shadowy spectres of an effete orthodoxy and the boastful assaults of rationalism. Leave us enough to believe that shall have power to hold us to a miraculously attested revelation from God through Jesus Christ to redeem and save men, and at the same time relieve us from the necessity of yielding credence to such views of Scripture as can no longer be warranted by history, or reason, or sober facts, — this is the demand of those who have looked to the religious literature of our brotherhood for mental and spiritual help.

This work of mediating between old orthodoxy and rationalism in the field of Scriptural criticism and historical faith, is an office which in part was assumed by, and for the rest has been delegated to, Liberal Christians. As the work was testing its own promise and our sufficiency to sustain its responsibilities, an element was introduced into the issue which nearly all our enemies, and a few even of our friends, regarded as a catastrophe. Mr. Norton and others had labored with all the

zeal and fidelity which the Christian faith has ever enlisted in its manifold demands upon its disciples, to authenticate the Christian Scriptures as historic testimonies of a divine revelation. In so doing, he and they only contributed new evidence of what had previously been proved by the works of distinguished scholars,—that Liberal Christians have performed the largest portion of service—considering their number among the sects—in vindicating the claims of our common Christianity. In these labors Liberal Christians have shared with their brethren of every Christian creed the highest sense of the importance of the questions which were at stake, and have received from such brethren many grateful tributes on the score of their zeal and success. It is a fact of which we might offer many striking illustrations, that, as Protestant prelatists when arguing against the assumptions of the Roman Church borrow many of their most effective weapons from the armories of the “Dissenters,” so those who have denied us the Christian name are not slow to avail themselves of the help of Lardner, Locke, and Norton in meeting the objections of unbelievers. Having thus authenticated the record for themselves and for their fellow-Christians, the Liberal party were, as we have said, working and waiting for the natural result which they expected in discussing the question, What is the Gospel, what is Christianity, as taught in these records in which we alike believe as coming from the pens of the Apostolic witnesses to a messenger from God? It was a question of interpretation; it is so still. But the “catastrophe” just alluded to interfered with the natural working of the process, and prejudiced it for thousands in this community. A form of rationalistic infidelity, not the offspring of Unitarianism in America, but of Lutheranism in Germany, was imported here under the ridiculous misnomer of *Transcendentalism*. It was called Deism in England, a century and a half ago. On its appearance on the continent of Europe, the Roman Catholics pointed at it as the *natural issue of Protestantism*; but in this country Unitarianism had to bear the burden of it,—it was “Unitarianism gone to seed,”—the inevitable fruit and result into which Liberal Christianity, by force of its own principles, must grow. The adoption of these ration-

alistic views from German books by men and women in the ranks of Unitarianism here was, we say, regarded by the most of its enemies, and by some of its friends, as a catastrophe. It has served the purposes of some persons ever since to confound a method of scholarly, deliberate, and reverential criticism, which seeks to interpret a record of admitted historic authority, with a form of philosophy which assails the authority of that record, and even denies to God the power of working or authenticating a miracle. The legitimate issues opened by Liberal Christianity, or Unitarianism, were thus arrested in their natural workings towards a decision on their own merits, and the party was made to bear the reproach of a philosophy to which, as a party, it had always been openly hostile.

Still, if this rationalistic philosophy had not been imported here, from the source and at the time of its reception, it would sooner or later have had a native growth. We have no objection to admit that it would have sprung up among the Unitarians, simply because they formed the advanced party of inquirers, thinkers, and critics. Let it be understood, however, that a Christian fellowship founded upon some distinguishing views of the meaning of a record has no necessary responsibility for a philosophy which assails the record and the attributes of that God to whom a revelation is referred. Yet it will henceforward be the office of Liberal Christianity to mediate between a rejected orthodoxy and unbelief in revelation. The question will again and again be asked over these volumes of Mr. Norton, Will their contents serve to convey and to confirm such a view of the Christian religion as will compel us to believe in it as a miraculous revelation from God, and at the same time offer to us a faith upon which heart, mind, and soul, reason and piety, may fasten as suited to all our needs in life? Is the truth on this great question exactly such as Mr. Norton presents it, — or is it something more, or something less? He teaches us to exercise our reasoning faculties, our judgment, and something of our individual discretion, in pronouncing upon the Apostolic authority of a record, in interpreting its meaning, and in deciding whether we have in any given passage the real words of a companion of Jesus, and

whether the writer did or did not rightly understand and report the words of his Master. Have we a right so to treat such records? Can faith live on such materials? Having exercised our individual judgment so far, what hinders us from indulging it farther? By using our critical, philosophic, or rational liberty up to a certain point, and then denying the right of any one to follow it any farther, do we shut upon another a door which we opened for ourselves? Our own opinion is, that Mr. Norton's method and system are in the main sound, safe, and sufficient. Still we are not insensible to, and, so far from disguising, will freely express our view of some practical perplexities which must be faced by us as best we may.

There is one consideration to be taken into account which has a very important bearing on the question before us,—the question, namely, whether a practical test extended through the lifetime of a generation has approved the views of Scripture which Mr. Norton's pupils derived from his instruction. Mr. Norton was never a pastor, and only for a very brief space of his professional career occupied a pulpit as an occasional preacher. His scholarly lessons were always addressed to an academic circle, to a few disciples of cultivated minds, never to promiscuous audiences such as are gathered in our churches. Now the severest trial to which his method of Scripture criticism and interpretation can be subjected, is in the routine of service required of a Christian minister in his double office of a preacher and a pastor. The study and the pulpit raise many exacting and difficult issues for one who is in turn the occupant of both of them. The prerogatives of the pulpit are secured by the long-established convictions of Christendom, that there is an authenticated Gospel to be preached in it. Every association of the highest character connected with a pulpit, the reasons for erecting a pulpit, the functions and responsibility of the man who is asked to occupy it, all take for granted that the foundation for it and for him is already laid in the reality of a revelation. The Bible laid upon the pulpit makes it an altar, designates the God who is there worshipped through Christ, and furnishes the minister with a guide and a sanction for his preaching. Our churches would be deserted within

one year after a general announcement were made that there was nothing to be had in them but the staple of man's wit and fancy. It is in the study that the minister must exercise himself with the perplexities of faith, and with the greater perplexities presented by the fact that the Scriptures are set in popular estimate upon a false footing, are invested with a character which they do not claim for themselves, and that the religious use of them depends for very many persons upon fostering this prejudice rather than correcting it. To shake a superstitious faith and to substitute a sure and better faith has ever been found by religious teachers to be the most difficult of all their tasks; because those who are so weak as to hold a superstitious faith are not strong and wise enough to appreciate a reasonable faith. To make those abatements from a prevailing estimate of the Scriptures which critical study proves to be necessary, and yet to leave the Scriptures available for the sacred uses they must serve,—to do this discreetly and to edification in the pulpit is no easy work.

There is one mode of using the Scriptures in the pulpit which is consistent with the prevailing or popular view of them as dictated by God, authenticated by his Spirit, and free from error of every kind. Illiterate preachers, who start up without education and undertake to expound the Bible, may still follow this method in perfect honesty, that is, if it be honest to attempt to teach something which we do not know ourselves. By this method the preacher and his hearers are on a level of ability; what is written is written, and it is all inspired; no one can go behind it, amend, criticise, or dispute it. The preacher must not search for errors; indeed, if he finds errors he must deny that they are errors. People must learn to swallow things which it is very doubtful whether they can digest, as the more alarming alternative is being choked by them or starved without them. There is another method of using the Scriptures in the pulpit which alone is consistent with such qualifications and abatements as intelligent criticism is compelled to make in loyalty to sacred truth. The preacher now has a great advantage over his hearers, one that he uses at discretion and with risk. He must in fact constitute himself the arbiter to them of what is Scripture. His

learning may enrich, but his judgment, or some guide that passes with him for judgment, must direct him. He must decide, through force of reasons satisfactory to himself, the extent and the effects of any such qualifications of historical truthfulness, Apostolic authority, or reliable authenticity as he allows to apply to Scripture. If he admits that the parts of the Bible are not of equal authority, he must say which of them have the most authority, which the least, and whether any of them have none at all. If he admits that the Apostles may have erred in understanding or in reporting the words of the Saviour, he must indicate when, where, and how far they erred, and must at least try to correct their errors. As the means for positive decision are not so clearly recognized as to carry with them anything like concord among critics as to the grounds and the degree of the allowance to be made in all the cases above referred to, the preacher must exercise and follow his own best judgment. He has a pulpit given to him as a preacher of a recognized and established Gospel from a Bible, and if he be not careful, he will leave nothing behind him but the covers of the book.

When a judge sits to interpret and apply the laws from a systematic and revised code, he has a very simple task before him. No word of his brings in question either the authority of any law in the code, or his own authority to interpret it. The statutes are all in force, whatever be the date of each, or the signature which gave it its final sanction. The uniform character and the equal authority of all the contents of the book, and its settled character and authority as a whole, make the judge's work to be intelligible and plain. But if the materials for the exercise of the judge's functions consist of a loose body of undigested, uncoded statutes, some of which are obsolete, some of which have been repealed, while some later ones conflict with earlier ones, and some lack the sanction necessary to give a law its binding force, and others of the statutes contravene the dictates of common sense, or the great ordinances of nature and Providence, — if a judge has such materials to deal with, and all in the court are looking to him as by the rectifications of his own wisdom he shall reach a decision in each case, men would pronounce law to be even a more uncertain thing than it is now.

There are preachers occupying pulpits who feel at liberty to regard and represent the whole Bible as answering to the description of the thoroughly digested statute-book, all whose successive statutes have received from the Supreme Legislator an everlasting sanction. There are others, who, taking the view of the Bible which answers to the second part of the above illustration, still feel at liberty to occupy pulpits. It is difficult to say which class of preachers have the more embarrassments to encounter in their office. But our point is to define the real and specific embarrassment attending the method of criticism which we have been discussing. This method makes us intellectually critics and judges of the various contents of a volume, which we value and study only because we believe that in some sense and to some extent it contains wisdom higher than our own, and records an especial revelation from God. The book is to judge us, and yet we judge the book. Our recent legislation has constituted juries judges of the law, but has stopped short at least of the ventures of Scripture criticism, in that it has extended no such prerogative to parties on trial.

Take now some of the critical conclusions reached by Mr. Norton, as presenting the perplexity with which we have to deal. After alluding to the notion of the Jews concerning "possession by devils," he refers to the objection founded on the Saviour's use of language conformed to the truth of the belief. He explains this fact by saying that it was necessary to the fulfilment by Jesus of the ultimate purposes of his mission, that he should refrain from attacking this and some other gross errors of his countrymen. Jesus therefore sometimes adopted common language though founded on erroneous conceptions. Now all must admit the force of this plea, but the difficulty is in limiting its application by any other restriction than one furnished by the subjective test of each interpreter; and experience has shown that this subjective test is so critical or exacting, or liberal, in different minds, as to confound all the recognized criteria of truth. Some critics will make that concession cover many Jewish opinions, and some have ventured to affirm that Jesus not only allowed some errors to go without correction, but was himself not wholly free from their influence.

In conformity with his well-known views of the Jewish Law, which he had forcibly expressed in a note to his work on the Genuineness of the Gospels, Mr. Norton frequently makes allowances in his present volume of notes for which we see no occasion, and on which more than on any other incidental point many readers will dissent from him. On page 118, for instance, he says that Jesus taught "indirectly the superstitious character of such observances as the Levitical Law required." On page 169, he says that Jesus "declares the law itself, in the particular in question, [the putting away of a wife,] essentially bad, and contrary to the will of God." So far are we from according with these conclusions, that we must venture to confess that we read them with amazement, and wonder how or why Mr. Norton was brought to them. We cannot find a trace of superstition in the Jewish Law, nor the slightest token that the Saviour thought it superstitious, least of all that he pronounced it to be so. That what God allows "on account of the hardness of men's hearts" is by that very condition exempted from being necessarily and under all circumstances contrary to his law is, we think, a reasonable inference. There are whole tribes of men now on the earth to whom it would be an incalculable blessing to be brought under just such a system as the Jewish law, in all its provisions. Considering that, by the very terms of its enactment, it was confessedly temporary, provisional, and preparative to something better, its claims are modest, and, we think, may be substantiated. But to go the length that Mr. Norton goes on this incidental point, we have thought since we first became acquainted with his views on the subject, would be exceedingly apt to authorize any one to go farther.

As a specimen of another class of admissions, impairing an unqualified confidence in the Apostolic authority of the whole contents of the Gospels, and constituting the judgment of each individual the arbiter as to what has that sanction and what has not, take the following. On the clause in Mark vii. 13, "And many like things do ye," Mr. Norton remarks: "These words, which seem rather to take from than to increase the effect of what precedes, and which are not found in Matthew, may be conjectured to be an addition of some reporter

of our Lord's discourse." The conjecture as applied to the particular passage is harmless; but what if such conjectures be multiplied, and extended over the contents of the Gospels?

Again, in his comments on the introduction to Luke's Gospel, Mr. Norton, while avowing his belief in the miraculous conception of Jesus as most consistent with God's purposes in his mission, yields this allowance in reference to Luke's narrative: "It is in a style rather poetical than historical. It was probably not committed to writing till after the death of Mary, and of all the other individuals particularly concerned. With its real miracles, the fictions of oral tradition had probably become blended; and the individual by whom it was committed to writing probably added what he regarded as poetical embellishments." (Vol. II. p. 245.) We may grant that there is nothing more reasonable than such a supposition. But to define the limits of its application involves a serious embarrassment. Once admit that there is a legendary element mingled with the historical narratives of the Gospels, and an issue is opened in which men of equal wisdom, scholarship, and good judgment will array themselves as respectively the champions of the legend or the history, and the claims of the former will be pressed to the most serious consequences.

In this, then, consists the practical difficulty presented to one who must study these things as a scholar, and then stand in the pulpit to preach. The perplexity to the common mind attaches to the attempt to reconcile the value and authority of the Scriptures with this mode of treating their contents. To make such abatements and allowances as are made to the misconceptions, the partial knowledge, and the errors of ordinary narrators, and yet to maintain the entire confidence that one wishes to feel about matters in which even the jot and the tittle become things of inexpressible importance, is the problem to be solved by those who would combine an intelligent criticism with a Christian's faith. The candid and fearless admissions made by Mr. Norton in loyalty to the spirit of truth, will be represented by some as a reproach upon the scholar's method of dealing with sacred things. The fact that he united with this schol-

arly candor the most penetrating conviction of the reality of a revelation through Christ, and the most grateful sense of its value to the world and to himself, should stand with all persons as the evidence that what he concedes as a critic did not in the least impair, but, on the contrary, did greatly strengthen his faith as a Christian. One must carefully follow his processes in order to judge of the results of his judgment on specific points of critical investigation. All of the admissions made by him, of each of the classes to which we have referred, are sustained in his pages by very deliberate and explicit statements of the reasons and grounds for them; and they are accompanied by cautious suggestions, which, to the prudent, may serve as safe limitations. If they are not in all cases conformed to the prevailing and generally accepted methods of Scriptural exposition, they do recognize the legitimate canons of sound reason and sacred truth. His principles may be regarded by some as inconsistently arrested, or as incompletely recognized in their application, while others may pronounce them to be fatal to their confidence in the historical testimony to a revelation. In Mr. Norton's own method of reaching and vindicating his conclusions, there is a combination of intelligence, prudence, moderation, candor, and reverence, such as has very rarely been brought to the tasks to which he gave his life. Conceit was odious to him. He is never ingenious, in the conventional sense of that epithet. He thought that probabilities were always to be taken into account where there was a conflict of testimony and a confusion of opinions; and he had an unquestioning confidence in the sufficiency of common sense to decide upon probabilities. He had mastered thoroughly the principles of historical criticism, reconciling the sceptical, the rational, and the believing elements which must enter into them. He had learned to identify the tokens of originality in a record, and to detect interpolations or verbal corruptions. He could conceive just how a class prejudice or a personal bias might affect the reception or the repetition of what had been seen or heard, and he could trust his own spiritual discernment, as it fastened upon the instances in which the Evangelists unconsciously bore testimony against themselves, in conveying to us lessons

whose lofty truths they did not comprehend. Mr. Norton started with the fact that the Evangelists, being private and uneducated men, sharing the prejudices of their race, must have been subject to some limitations of intelligence, apprehension, and skill in listening to, in understanding, and in recording the words and the deeds of their Master. He inferred that their records must needs be artless and without method. He knew that these records, once written, would be subject to the chances of time and ill use. Every allowance and admission and abatement made by him in his work as a Christian scholar upon these records, which yields to the exactions of criticism, or qualifies an exaggerated view of the infallibility of Scripture, is to be referred either to the indisputable fact, or to the reasonable inference, or to the matter of knowledge above stated. He wished to trace back the stream which, burdened with blessings of this life and the life to come, was bearing the Gospel through the world. He traced it, as he believed, to its source. The impurities which it had gathered in its way, those which entered into it when first its fount was opened, those even which mingled with it when human hands first sought to form a basin for its healing waters, and when human lips first tasted of it,—these were the conditions of an earthly necessity, which, while they stained the stream in its course, yet left the early rill and all its native drops divine. As in the Gospel narrative of the incident at the pool of Bethesda, Mr. Norton thought that a hand other than that of St. John had introduced the verse about the descent of the angel, so we may allow that the Gospel stream has passed through risks and liabilities; but still its waters heal by a power received from God.

There is one thought to which we must give utterance as we close what has been to us a grateful work. When the sacred records present us with perplexities which we cannot relieve, we fall back for comfort on that Christian consciousness, the precious result of ancient faith, of rich experience, and holy tradition, mingling with the instincts and testimony of each one's own heart, which is the warrant for Christian belief. We receive the Gospel from a long succession of generations, during each of which we find it believed, testified to, and assured by every form of intellectual, practical, and

spiritual testimony which men could offer to it. This historic evidence of the best sort must compensate for historic difficulties of other sorts. Those who lived before us under the light of the Gospel had a way of meeting its perplexities for them, which was satisfactory to them, and consistent with their heartiest faith in it. Even a passage of Scripture which has been used from the very first, as the written Gospel has been used, affectionately, confidently, and reverently, brings with it a sort of traditional interpretation, key, and commentary, which a Christian consciousness will accept in spite of much critical uneasiness. In expounding the letter of the text relating to the Last Supper, Mr. Norton is led to conclude that the Saviour did not then enjoin upon his disciples the observance of the rite that has been continued in the Christian Church. He does not object to the rite, but commends a participation in it for its own good uses, apart from the recognition of its appointment by Christ. But a Christian consciousness, drawn and nourished from the sources just mentioned, leads us to believe that the observance of that rite has the sanction and meets the wishes of the Master. There are texts which will authenticate that view. The Apostolic letter to the Corinthians renewed the authority of the ordinance. The instinctive compliance of the early Christians intimates that the ordinance was intended to be established. Thus, the interpretation of texts becomes committed to something more than criticism. The experiences and offerings of faith challenge their right to be admitted as testimonies to the Word, and as interpreters alike of its luminous and its dark sayings.

G. E. E.

ART. VII.—JAMES ON THE NATURE OF EVIL.*

THIS is a remarkable book by a remarkable man. Mr. James is remarkable because he combines, in no small

* *The Nature of Evil, considered in a Letter to the Rev. Edward Beecher, D.D., Author of "The Conflict of Ages."* By HENRY JAMES. New York: D. Appleton and Company. 1855. 16mo. pp. 348.

degree, the qualities of a seer, a metaphysician, and a poet. His spiritual insight, or intuitive glance at spiritual realities, is penetrating, and gives solidity to his books. They possess an internal substance which differences them from the writings of metaphysicians who, like Brownson and Bowen, for example, dwell mainly on the forms of thought and their external relations. Again, Mr. James is a metaphysician, with an intellect full of force and with great penetrating power, though, as it appears to us, in its order more synthetic than analytic. Again, his rhetoric flows in a stream of life through the book. His words are not the current coin of logic, passed from hand to hand till it is worn and has lost all sharpness of impress, but they have a power of their own and a life within themselves. Known by his former writings as the great Antinomian of our day, hating moralism as Marcion hated Judaism, he has in this book defined anew and strengthened that position. Withdrawing his forces from the untenable posts which he frankly admits himself to have too hastily taken, he has now intrenched himself in permanence on what he deems an impregnable position, and challenges the assault of the three great ecclesiastical powers of Christendom, whom he sees fit to describe as the Roman Catholic, Protestant, and Unitarian bodies. This work of his is the theological Sebastopol, not to be taken by these sects, either separately or in triple alliance. He asserts that the theology of all these parties is radically vitiated by a false philosophy. Thus, as though he had not opponents enough already in the theologians, he throws down the gauntlet also before all the philosophers, from the school of Plato to that of Hegel, considering them all vicious, false, and atheistic. In addition to these cartels of defiance, he challenges the teachers of natural religion, the professors of moral philosophy, and the reformers who take their stand on the supremacy of conscience. Natural religion he holds to be in contradiction to Christianity, the sentiment of responsibility a self-deception and fallacy, and conscience to be no original divine endowment of the soul, but only the badge of a fallen nature. Man in himself has no substantial or real existence; he is only a form, and altogether unsubstantial. His freedom is no self-determining power, and our sense of freedom and

responsibility, though very inspiring, is a great self-deception. It will be seen, therefore, that Mr. James has issued a challenge of a sufficiently comprehensive character. He walks up and down before the camp of our theological Israel, like Goliath of Gath, defying all our armies. If he is in error, there ought to be some young David to meet him with a few smooth stones out of the stream of truth.

The special occasion of this book is stated by Mr. James to be his unfeigned sympathy for the intellectual struggles of Dr. Edward Beecher, as manifested in his recent work entitled "The Conflict of Ages." Mr. James's book takes the form of a letter addressed to this gentleman, and is partly occupied in considering Dr. Beecher's position and course of argument. His tone is friendly, but rather patronizing. He means to be respectful, but evidently looks down upon Dr. Beecher's position and his argument. He assumes the seat of the instructor, and places Dr. Beecher before his chair, as a well-meaning little boy, who deserves to have his somewhat gross errors explained to him. "Good little boy," he seems to say, "you have done as well as you knew how, now let me explain it to you." Considering that the only real evil in the universe, according to Mr. James, is *self-sufficiency*, it is a little amusing to notice this entire complacency of tone and spirit.

However, the main question does not regard the tone or manner, but the substance, of the argument. If Mr. James is right in his main positions, if he has solved the problem of evil and terminated the conflict of ages, he surely has a right to a degree of self-complacency. If he has confuted all the theologians and philosophers who have ever lived, with the exception of Swedenborg, we may pardon him a good opinion of his own powers. This, therefore, is the question for us to consider. It is manifestly impossible, in the short space allowed us, to examine even slightly the important questions discussed in so compact an argument through a book of three hundred pages. We can only hope to indicate our views on a few leading points, and the natural method will be, first, to endeavor fairly to state what Mr. James's doctrine of evil is, and then to ask if it be true, or if it be false, or if it be partly true and partly false.

The problem of Dr. Beecher is stated to be, "How can God be just in condemning and punishing evil?" The problem of Mr. James, on the contrary, is, "How can the *existence* of evil be reconciled with the government of a perfect God?" This last question is indeed the important one, and lies back of the other, and all attempts hitherto to explain it have resulted in explaining away one or the other of the two factors of the problem. Either *evil* is explained away and shown not to be really evil, which is optimism, or else *the absolute perfections of God* are denied, and evil is exalted into a rival power, which is Manichæism. If Mr. James can escape both of these rocks of offence, and steer his way safely between, we shall gladly admit that the problem is finally solved.

Mr. James divides evil into physical, moral, and spiritual, and defines them thus. Physical evil is the evil which one *SUFFERS*, moral evil is the evil which one *DOES*, and spiritual evil is the evil which one *IS*. Physical and moral evil he presently explains away, and declares them to be no evils at all, inasmuch as they are what he calls constitutional facts, or the necessary limitations of our finite nature. Physical suffering, as hunger for example, impels the animal to that effort which is his distinctive life. And he says that it is inconceivable that he should be animally organized without such a limitation. In like manner, moral evil is necessarily involved in the fact of our moral constitution, which is bounded by duty on the one side and by interest on the other, the perfect equipoise of which is the necessary condition of moral life. If they were not thus equally balanced, man's moral goodness and evil would be passive, and not active, that is, would not be moral at all. Moreover, man's self-hood or consciousness is, as he shows, conditional and dependent on this equipoise, and without it his consciousness would disappear. Thus physical evil, or the endurance of pain, is the necessary condition of animal life, and moral evil, or the doing what is wrong, the indispensable condition of moral life, and therefore neither of these can be really evil. It only remains, therefore, to investigate spiritual evil, or the evil which man is, to learn its nature, and see whether that also can or cannot be accounted for.

This spiritual evil which Mr. James declares to be the only real evil in the universe, he defines to be essentially the principle of self-hood or of supposed independence in man, or, as he elsewhere expresses it, believing that life is in ourselves. This it is which separates us from God, and this is the source of real death, the only death that there is. This sense of self-hood in man Mr. James pronounces to be an unmixed evil. The question therefore is, How did it come, and how is it to be explained consistently with the perfections of God?

Mr. James finds great fault with the common philosophy and theology, because it considers creation as an absolute work of God, and because it considers man as created with life in himself. He denies that God creates naturally, or in space and time, and asserts that he creates always spiritually, that is, as it should seem, by creating persons. It would be impossible, he asserts, (following Swedenborg,) for God to create any being with life in himself. The life which is in man is God's life, not his own, flowing into him from God. Man, therefore, is not a substantive being, but only a form. For God, he says, is inhibited by his own perfection from giving an absolute self-hood to his creature, or, which is the same thing, from creating a being who shall be independent of himself. Man, therefore, is only a form, and his life is not an absolute life, but a conditional one, and spiritual evil originates in his thinking that his life is in himself. This is the fall of man. It is mistaking the source of our life, thinking it to be in ourselves when, in fact, it is in God.

But if man out of God be only a form, it follows that his freedom and responsibility must be quite other than they are usually thought to be. Accordingly Mr. James teaches that his freedom is not *absolute* freedom, but *rational* freedom, or freedom in order to something else. It is not given for its own sake, but for the sake of the creature's spiritual elevation, being thus a freedom strictly in order to his eternal conjunction with God. He is free to transcend and control his bodily appetites, but cannot become independent of God.

But this freedom is by no means a power of self-determination. And the responsibility which it implies is very limited. The sentiment of responsibility he declares

to be corrupt and fallacious in itself; corrupt, that is, so far as it attributes the origin of good or evil to ourselves, since the moral good comes from God into us, and the moral evil comes into us from beneath, from the hells. Our moral consciousness, which results from our being placed in an exact equipoise between good and evil, induces us to attribute to ourselves the source of our conduct. But all this is an error. Conscience indeed affirms it to be so, but conscience is mistaken.

What then is conscience, according to Mr. James? It is the badge of a fallen nature. It makes us feel responsible for the good and evil which is in us, which is a terrible error. Its affirmations are not absolutely true, but possess only a partial truth as they take color from a vitiated spiritual state of man. Conscience is not an original faculty of the soul, nor does it express the normal relation between the Creator and the creature, but is only a shrouded presence of God, the fruit of a spiritual declension on our part, and not an original divine endowment of the soul.

This brings us to Mr. James's view of morality, or obedience to the law. The law, he declares, was never intended to make men really good, but merely to show them their real evil. Morality by itself (meaning the sentiment of self-hood) is an unmixed evil, a fountain of inexhaustible disease and death. The moral man is no better before God than the immoral man. And if he thinks himself better, he becomes immediately vastly worse. Imposed upon by his conscience, he is likely to think himself better, and therefore he is likely to be much worse. Therefore it was that, when Christ was on earth, he knew no enemy but the Pharisee, who trusted in himself that he was righteous and despised others. Those who teach that obedience to the moral instincts will make us acceptable to God, are teaching pure infidelity. For these instincts are the inmost home and source of human pride. Those however who exalt the moral instincts become very popular with the Pharisees; as an example of which teachers he mentions Dr. Channing and Fénelon. Moral distinctions, therefore, are only the shadows of spiritual distinctions, and there is no real superiority of the good man over the bad man; the man who lies, and steals, and murders being just as

good in God's sight as the holiest saint or the most generous martyr.

Nevertheless, Mr. James approves of goodness, and on the whole prefers it to moral evil. In some places he even seems to take back what he has said against it, and makes it an essential condition of union with God, declaring that a man who blesses his brother receives, in consequence, the divine life into his own soul, while he who injures his brother excludes it. He also asserts that God is infinitely averse to the deeds of the evil man, which would seem to imply the absoluteness of morality. On the whole, however, he makes very small account of the moral man.

But what, according to Mr. James, is the work of Christ? Not to remove our liability to physical or moral evil. For, as these are facts of our constitution, we must always remain liable to them. The work of Christ was twofold. First, and chiefly, Redemption. Next, and secondarily, Salvation. The great work of Christ, that which the Apostles preached, and in which they gloried, was not future salvation, but past redemption, of which the resurrection of Christ was the evidence and seal. Redemption was a great victory achieved over death and hell, which delivered all men, for the future, without exception, from their constraining power. This means that God, in Christ, descended to carnal conditions, and by the suffering of temptations thence derived overcame the power of evil. God becoming united with man in Christ redeems him from spiritual death, into which he had become utterly sunk, so as to lose his spiritual freedom. By thus undergoing the extremest temptations of evil, of which he otherwise was ignorant, and overcoming them, he reduced the spiritual universe to order, and opened a pathway for the freest communication of his spirit with man, reducing the hells equally with the heavens to his obedience. Henceforth men were no longer constrained into evil, but angels, men, and devils were equally freed from its power.

The ground of the Incarnation is therefore the spiritual death of man, a universal spiritual death which reigned everywhere, and from which men were incapable of extricating themselves. But Christ's redemption

eats up the consequences of the fall, destroying every obstacle which before existed to the most intimate conjunction of God and man. The fall impaired man's freedom, redemption restores it. And now the Divine love flows freely into every saint or sinner who is willing to receive it. The gift of redemption is free to all, is an outward or absolute process, an objective work which took place centuries before we were born, making man spiritually his own master. But this redemption is strictly in order to another work, viz. reconciliation or salvation, which is an inward voluntary and regenerative process, subjective and depending on the choice of the individual; not universal, therefore, like redemption. Salvation comes from our faith in redemption, and is the grateful acquiescence of the soul in this fact, and the voluntary reception of Divine love.

It remains only to see what those laws of creation are which, according to Mr. James, enable us to understand evil.

God's creation is not absolute, nor a phenomenon of space or time. Nor does he create anything which has life in itself, but only subjects of life. Creation is a rational proceeding, the purpose of which is, that there should be an eternal conjunction between God and the creature. He therefore creates subjects in which he may dwell. And these subjects must receive his love and wisdom as of themselves; that is, freely. God cannot create anything which should have life in itself, since this would be to create God. Therefore he can only create organs of life, which, however, must receive his life freely or rationally, because, if it were forced on them, it would prove a power of resisting, which would argue a life of their own. God therefore creates not things, but persons, who are only organs of his life. And God gives to man incessantly the semblance or appearance of being; because, unless man appeared to himself to be, the life of heavenly blessedness could not take place. For man must appear full of life and power, and God must guard the interests of his freedom, because on these his regeneration depends. Our very humanity consists, says Swedenborg, in feeling that life in us is our own. Without this feeling, we could not possibly become spiritually joined with God. But when we are

admitted behind the scenes, and view things spiritually, we know that man's moral power is nothing in itself, that man never overcomes in temptation, but only the Lord in him, and that it is never his own power which inclines him to evil, but invariably the power of evil spirits.

We have thus stated the views of Mr. James on all the essential points of his treatise. In condensing them, we have, of course, made their meaning less intelligible. And whoever would understand them thoroughly, must read his book. Yet we have aimed to do justice to his thought as far as possible, using almost everywhere his own words, so that we trust that we have not essentially misrepresented him. We must now proceed to an examination of his theory, in regard to its truth or error, and in regard to its adequacy to solve the problem of evil.

The problem, as we have seen, is this:—How can we reconcile the existence of evil with the perfections of God? The true solution of the problem must therefore reconcile these two facts, and must not omit or explain away either of them. We must show that evil is required by the Divine perfections, and that it is a manifestation of them. And yet it must not be denied nor confounded with good. In other words, it must be shown to be the *sine qua non* condition of good, without which good is inconceivable, or the indispensable material out of which good is manufactured. If there remains a conceivable possibility of the existence of good without evil, then the problem is not thoroughly nor satisfactorily solved.

Applying this rule to the procedure of Mr. James, let us adopt his own distinction of Physical, Moral, and Spiritual Evil.

Let us first look at his explanation of Physical Evil. He defines it to be the evil that we suffer, thus distinguishing it from moral evil which we do, and spiritual evil which we are. Is the definition adequate and the distinction sound? We doubt if they are. By suffering he must either mean pure passivity, or else he must mean the passion of pain. But passivity, in a physical sense, is not always evil, and the suffering of pain is not always physical evil. There is mental and

there is moral pain which we suffer, no less than physical pain. And therefore moral evil, no less than physical, is the evil which we suffer, and the distinction is not a satisfactory one. Physical evil is the evil which affects us through the body or the physical system.

And now, how does he explain the existence of physical evil? His explanation virtually denies its existence. Of course he must deny its existence if he denies all reality to the physical universe; for if there is no physical universe, there can hardly be any physical evil. Now, it is a fundamental doctrine with Mr. James, that the only real world, or substantial world, is the world of affection and thought. (p. 298.) And again, the world of nature is not the real world. (p. 310.) But, moreover, his view of the Deity as not involving in himself the elements of space and time, which are the elements of the physical world, compels him to deny the real existence of that world, and with it the distinction of beings from other beings in space, and from their own past and future in time. For as, according to him, God is the only Being, if time and space do not exist in God, they do not exist at all. Now Mr. James distinctly asserts that there is, in truth, but one being in the world, — God; thus denying to nature, not only independent existence, but also real existence. It is, therefore, very evident that Mr. James cannot explain the existence of physical evil, for the simple reason that he denies its existence.

It may, however, be said, that, by defining physical evil to be that which we suffer, Mr. James makes of it a purely subjective fact of the human soul, and so lifts it out of any necessary connection with a real physical universe. Without stopping to question the propriety of calling that evil physical which has its basis in no physical existence, we will accept this nomenclature, and look at his explanation according to his own definition. Whatever evil a man suffers, even though it be mental or moral suffering, we will, for the present, call physical, and ask how Mr. James reconciles its existence with the Divine perfections. He considers suffering as belonging to the necessary limitation of man's finite nature. As man is finite, he must be limited. And that which limits his existence constitutes his existence, — just, we suppose, as the lines which limit the

triangle constitute the triangle. "Pain and pleasure," he says, "are the necessary boundaries of animal life, and animal life is inconceivable without them." "I cannot conceive," he says, "of man's being animally organized at all, without a liability to suffer whenever an outward impediment exists to the supply of his wants." But to this statement there are two answers. First, that a liability to suffering is not actual suffering, and the problem which he has undertaken to solve is not the liability to evil, but the existence of evil, which are two somewhat different things. If evil did not really exist, man might still be liable to evil, and a problem might then arise on that point. A conflict would then exist between this fact of possible evil and the Divine power or wisdom, but not, as in the other case, with the Divine goodness. Man being made constitutionally liable to evil, but being preserved from actual evil by the Divine Providence, there would not be the same intellectual problem as at present. And, secondly, this definition explains evil as a limitation of man's finite nature, i. e. as something negative, but does not explain it as anything positive or real. It makes of it a matter of more and less; i. e. it virtually makes of evil only a less quantity of good. But this, it is evident, though a very common form of solution, is only another way of explaining the existence of evil by denying its existence. And, accordingly, that which is really inconceivable in our conception of man's animal life is the absence of the limitation of more and less. Supposing that limitation to exist, we can conceive of him without the limitation of pain and pleasure. For, if this were not so, the actual experience of man would be at every moment that of a flight from pain to pleasure, which is surely not the case.

Passing on, in the next place, to Moral Evil, let us look at his definition and explanation of this also.

Mr. James defines moral evil to be the evil that we do. But is this an adequate definition? Does not moral evil also consist in yielding, in submission to bad influences? Human language speaks of indulging the passions, as a large part of moral evil. And how significantly does this term, *PASSIONS*, express the source of much immorality.

Moreover, Mr. James himself seems sometimes to forget his own definition. For example, he says (p. 179), that the moral law demands of us love. Hence, not to love is a moral evil, and moral evil is something else than the evil which we do.

Nevertheless, we will accept his definition, as in the former case, and see how far, with this account of moral evil, he succeeds in explaining it. His explanation consists in placing it on a level with physical evil, as proceeding necessarily from man's rational organization. Man's freedom consists in a balance or limitation between duty on the one side, and interest on the other. His good and bad actions are simply features of his rational organization, with which he is not to be inwardly chargeable. Moral evil, therefore, like physical evil, is no evil at all, and is explained by being set aside. Perhaps the speciality of Mr. James's theory, and certainly the point which he labors most earnestly, is in fact just this denial of the reality of moral good and evil. In the sight of God the good man who is just and kind, temperate and truthful, is no more deserving of approbation than the man who lies and steals and leads a life of the coarsest self-indulgence. Moral distinctions, according to Mr. James, are not eternal, but only shadowy and transient. The good and bad man are not essentially different, and the only real evil in the universe consists in believing otherwise. But inasmuch as our moral instincts do assert otherwise, he maintains them to be delusive. Inasmuch as conscience asserts otherwise, he denies it to be an original divine endowment of the soul. Inasmuch as we seem to be responsible for our moral character, he declares this sense of responsibility to God to be corrupt and fallacious. The affirmation of conscience he denies to be absolutely true, and man's freedom, in its common acceptation, is a mere self-delusion. Let us, therefore, say something in regard to this position, which we regard to be an error that has arisen from pushing the truths of Christian experience to an unwarrantable and one-sided extreme.

For, in denying the absolute nature of moral distinctions, is it not apparent that Mr. James strikes at the root of *all* convictions and *all* certainty? If there is one primal conviction of the human mind which runs deeper

than most others, and which lies as a foundation of human faith and action, it is the immutability of moral distinctions. In all ages and in all countries, wherever man exists, this conviction has been found thus deeply rooted in his mind. Our faith in God, in any just sense of the word, rests upon this conviction, and not the reverse. To believe in God is to believe in the Good One. And, consequently, we must believe in goodness before we can believe in God. But to tell us that the distinction between right and wrong, good and evil, is not absolute, but shadowy and transient, is to lay the foundation of the most hopeless atheism.

Again, suppose that it were possible to believe in any thing as fixed and certain, when we have come to disbelieve in the moral instincts; suppose we could believe in God, it would be as a being devoid of moral character. For if our own moral condition, manifesting itself in acts of justice and mercy, is not to be regarded as anything positive or real, neither can the Divine goodness, manifesting itself in like acts, be regarded as possessing any positive character. The goodness of the good man is the mirror in which we see an imperfect manifestation of absolute goodness. It is only through the experience of justice, generosity, and purity that we can climb to a conception of the Divine holiness. "He who loveth not his brother whom he has seen, how shall he love God whom he has not seen?" The Apostle clearly intimates, that it is only by loving man, whom we see, that we can get an idea of the Divine loveliness. Hence, the moment that I am taught to distrust the moral instincts which teach me that the man of truth is, in so far, really better than the man of falsehood, I am also taught to distrust my conception of the moral character of God. If goodness and truth in man are not merely imperfect, but also delusive, they may deceive us when predicated of the Deity.

The only reply which Mr. James can make to this is to fall back upon his view of man, which regards him as a mere channel through which good and evil may flow. Goodness in God, he may say, is real as a part of his character. But *our* goodness only flows from above, from Him, as our evil also flows from beneath, from the hells. The goodness, therefore, of the good

man is real, but it is not his own. But this view, as he himself asserts, is not that which our moral instincts teach. We do not love the good man as a channel through which good is flowing, but as a fountain out of which it pours. We do not attribute radiance to the glass window, no matter how transparent it may be, through which the sun shines, but to the little lamp which sends its narrow beam far into the darkness, — the natural emblem of the shining of a good action in our naughty world. Our very humanity consists, he himself says, in feeling that life is in us as our own. Otherwise we could not be allied to the angel, or distinguished from the brute. But now, Mr. James has written a book, the object of which is to convince us of the contrary, namely, to make us feel that our life is not our own. His success, therefore, would be strictly equivalent, according to his own showing, with the demolition of our spiritual nature, and would make it impossible for us to conceive of the spiritual character of God.

We can understand what Mr. James means when he declares that all good that is in man flows from God. But we confess to a little difficulty as regards the source of his moral evil. That, he tells us, flows into us from the hells, which are the societies of evil spirits. But the evil in *them*, — whence comes it? If it comes from themselves, then they must have a life, according to his reasoning, independent of God, which is impossible. To say that it comes into them from other evil spirits is, of course, only to remove the difficulty farther off. To refer it to God he would consider blasphemy. Hence, it only remains to deny its existence altogether, and to make of it, like every other form of evil thus far, a mere negation, or the somewhat less of good.

But Mr. James, though thus continually drifted by his theory toward a system of pure pantheistic optimism, struggles now and then manfully against its overcoming stress, and, turning round, contradicts himself in the calmest manner. Thus (on p. 222) he tranquilly affirms that "it is of course eternally true that God is infinitely averse to the deeds of the evil man. He is infinitely averse to all murder, treachery, and guile." But these actions are acts of moral evil. And to assert that God

is infinitely averse to moral evil, is to make moral distinctions absolute distinctions, which is the very thing that Mr. James has been all along denying. He endeavors to help himself out of the difficulty by the following sentence. "God indeed forbids us to rob or murder or deceive our neighbor in any way, but this is not, as so many suppose, in order that we may become differenced from other people or from our former selves, but only in order that, by refraining from these things and so denying the interior influence of evil, we may open our hearts to the access of pity, gentleness, mercy, and peace from him. He hates evil, to be sure, but the positive aspect of that sentiment is, that he loves to communicate his own goodness to us." True. But we would inquire whether we do not become "differenced from our former selves" when we receive this access of Divine good? And what matters it whether we say, "The man is better who refrains from doing wrong," or say, "The man is better who refrains from doing wrong, *because* he thereby receives God's love?" Mr. James is obliged plainly to teach that the salvation of man consists in his refraining from evil and accepting good. It is our putting away freely the evils of our life from a sense of love to God. So that, when he is arguing in this direction, he does not deny that a man will by moral fidelity come nearer to God, but only asserts (what no one ever doubted) that the good man ought not to be *proud* of his goodness, or to think that he has any meritorious right to salvation. If the net result of the argument is only the condemnation of spiritual pride, we do not think that Mr. James will find any antagonists. We all say, as he does, that the good man has no business to pride himself on his goodness, or consider heaven the reward of his desert. The only questions are these: "Is he *really* any better in the sight of God than the bad man? Is he more likely to come into union with God than the bad man?" Mr. James says no to the first question, but yes to the last. He thinks that he is no better than the bad man, but is sure that he is much nearer to God, and is alone capable of the reception of his love and life.

Let us now proceed to consider the last kind of evil, which is Spiritual Evil. Mr. James has explained Phys-

ical and Moral Evil by explaining them away. Not only his general principles compel him to deny to them reality, but he asserts the same thing in terms over and over again. Thus he says that the only real evil in the universe is spiritual evil, which consists in the principle of self-hood. Spiritual evil, he says, consists in our feeling, and hence believing, that life is in ourselves. This he calls elsewhere the principle of independence in man. And this he declares to be the only sin. Nevertheless (p. 272) he follows Swedenborg in asserting that our very humanity consists in feeling that the life in us is our own. Accordingly, our very humanity is necessarily spiritual evil or sin, which would seem to bring us to a very thorough total depravity.

It is not very easy to see precisely what Mr. James means by spiritual evil. Sometimes it is a purely intellectual error, and consists in the mistaken opinion that our life is our own, as when he says (p. 76), "the sole curse of man, from the first, is attributing to himself his good and evil." But (p. 243) it is wrong affection; "the only spiritual evil is in loving ourselves supremely." In two different places he asserts that only the angel can say, God be merciful to me a sinner (p. 147). And again, only the regenerate man or angel is ever conscious of sin. But as the angel is *not* blind to the truth of his dependence upon God, and as the regenerate man is the one who has risen above spiritual pride, it would seem to follow that he was not under the curse of sin, and therefore could *not* truthfully regard himself as a sinner. We will leave Mr. James to reconcile these two statements of his, and ask how he solves the problem of spiritual evil? Now at least we have reached something real. Spiritual evil, self-hood, self-complacency, is at all events real evil. How is it to be reconciled, then, with the perfections of God? How does Mr. James account for its existence?

He accounts for the origin of spiritual evil very simply. It was necessary, he says, that we should be so made that, while we really have no life in ourselves, we should seem to have such a life in order that we should seem to be free. This alone lifts us above the controlling influence of nature, and enables us to come into union with God. We feel as if we were free and responsible. Not

that we really are so, but we seem to be so. "We cannot act from ourselves, but we can act *as* from ourselves." In other words, we can pretend to be free, and counterfeit freedom. We must not *believe* ourselves free, for that will be to fall into the worst, into spiritual evil. But we must *make believe* that we are free, otherwise we can obtain no 'spiritual good. This is the ticklish condition in which man is placed. This is the bridge AL-SIRAT, with edge as sharp as a razor, over which we must skate into heaven. But this, of course, is a difficult problem to accomplish, and man, in fact, has utterly failed of doing it. Hear Mr. James's account of the matter: "But we all know how naturally or inevitably the feeling of absolute self-hood supervenes upon this sentiment of freedom, or becomes ingrafted on it. The growth of the sensuous principle in us, or the progress of our dominion over nature, causes us to value our freedom *in se*, or for its own independent sake, and not merely for the sake of its ulterior, celestial, and spiritual ends. The life of nature becomes gradually more pronounced in us. Beneficent genii appear to wait upon all man's efforts to realize a bountiful life in outward things, and we accordingly conceive a distrust for the old traditions which pointed our hope and postponed our best expectations to the access of a superior life. Thus we begin to feel, not merely freedom, but an absolute self-hood or property in nature." (pp. 242, 243.)

Here, then, we have the solution of the problem. Evil comes into the world whenever man acts from himself instead of acting *as* from himself, whenever he acts as if he had a real freedom instead of acting as if he had a *quasi* freedom. And this happens "naturally or inevitably." Let us stop upon these words, for here is the pith of the whole solution. We must ask Mr. James which of these two terms expresses his meaning, for the difference between them is not small as regards our problem. If he can show that the necessary sentiment of freedom passes "inevitably" into one of absolute self-hood, we shall admit the problem of evil to be fully solved on his own premises. But if he only shows that absolute self-hood supervenes "naturally," he is as far as ever from the solution. "Naturally or inevitably" will not do. He might as well say "probably or necessarily." As far

as we can see, neither he nor Swedenborg, whom he follows, has shown the *inevitable* origin of evil, on their own premises, but only a tendency toward it. All that would have been required, in order to have prevented the origin of all evil in the universe, was to have made man always thoroughly acquainted with the fact that his apparent freedom was only apparent, and not real. It is certainly conceivable that God might have communicated to man with the feeling of his independence the knowledge of his dependence. This would have satisfied all the demands of Mr. James's theory, and would at the same time for ever have excluded evil from the universe. No reason is given for its not having been done, and consequently the problem of evil is as much unsolved as ever.

Mr. James's solution, therefore, fails in *both* directions, running not only into optimism, but also into its opposite. By making God the only being in the universe, and man's being only apparent, and not real, he logically denies the reality of spiritual evil, as he had before denied in terms the reality of physical and moral evil. For if man, the *subject* of evil, is only an appearance not a reality, the evil which inheres in him must also be only an appearance and not a reality. But again, supposing it to be real, it exists and continues as a growth of nature, as a process unprovided for by the divine reason, as an abnormal development outside of deity. In this, also, Mr. James's theory is consequent. For a spiritual pantheism denying God's real existence in nature, and yet utterly unable to dispense with nature, will always virtually exclude God from the time-and-space side of the universe, and whatever goes on there will go on quite independent of him.

We have thus endeavored to show the flaw in Mr. James's conclusion, even assuming the truth of his own premises; but we can by no means accept these premises. We do not believe that self-reliance is the only form of spiritual evil, nor that dependence on God is the only form of spiritual good. We believe that there are two kinds of spiritual evil, the one SELF-RELIANCE and the other SELF-DIRECTION, correlative to two kinds of spiritual good proceeding from the sense of duty and the sense of dependence; otherwise, activity *toward* the good and dependence *on* the good, or GOD-RELIANCE and

GOD-DIRECTION. In God there is wisdom and also love, which are the two faces of the one Divine Goodness, wisdom flowing out into the infinite order of the outward universe, love flowing in as the perpetual support of all being. God thus manifests himself both outwardly and inwardly to man. We are in him, and he in us. He exists both in time and in eternity, immanent in the outward universe as its perpetual support, and being inwardly the supporting life in the soul of man. Neither man nor the universe is independent of God. They have real being, but not independent being. This view of the perpetual derivation of being from God does not (as Mr. James seems to assert) imply any diminution of the Divine Being, any more than the uttering of our thought diminishes the amount of our thought, or the outflow of our love impairs our love. From this twofold manifestation of the Deity (which Swedenborg also plainly sets forth) there proceeds man's twofold goodness of moral effort and religious trust, which only in union constitute his true life. The sight of the Divine Law awakens the moral nature; the sight of the Divine Love awakens the spiritual nature; law being a preparation for love, and love fulfilling law.

Now the fundamental error of Mr. James, as it seems to us, is, that he turns the antagonism of law and love into a contradiction. He thus makes the Divine Love a denial of the Divine Wisdom, eternity a denial of time, spirit a denial of nature, the infinite being of God a denial of the finite being of man, the Gospel not a fulfilment but a refutation of the Law, and Christianity the abolition of conscience, of the sense of responsibility, and of personal morality, landing us at last as the logical result in a spiritualism akin to that of Brahminism, in which the finite is all *Maya*, or delusion. In that system, the great work to be done in order to purify the soul is to arrive at the conviction that all nature is nothing, that the gods are nothing, that we ourselves are nothing, and that Brahm is the only substance, the sole reality. Mr. James, no doubt, stops far short of all this. No doubt with him variety is as certain an existence as unity, form as eternal as substance. But logically, he tends steadily towards that result.

We cannot speak as we should like to do of his doc-

trine of Christian redemption and salvation. This is especially interesting as the latest result of the tendency which has always existed in the Christian Church to regard the work of Christ as both objective and subjective, laying sometimes more stress on the one and sometimes on the other. In the early centuries of the Christian Church the objective work of Christ was popularized under the form of a battle with Satan, in which conflict Satan was overthrown and his prisoners rescued. In the Middle Ages, the same tendency to exalt the objective side of Christian salvation expressed itself in Anselm's theory of a debt paid to God; which theory maintained its triumphant pre-eminence till the days of Grotius. Since that time the subjective view of human life, awakened by the Reformation, has caused Christ's work to be regarded as mainly one on the human soul. The present reaction in this book toward an extreme objective view is, therefore, somewhat remarkable. But it is so imperfectly developed, that it is not possible fully to understand it, and therefore we cannot pretend to criticise it. Mr. James does not explain at all how God's "descent to carnal conditions" and "suffering temptations thence derived" had the effect of "bringing the spiritual universe to order." Nor does he give the least proof, Scriptural or rational, in support of these positions. We cannot, however, help noticing here what we have before suggested, that spiritual pantheism is really a limitation of God. Mr. James makes the incarnation the means of introducing God, for the first time, to an acquaintance with the world of nature. He declares (p. 188) that, apart from the incarnation, God was "wholly ignorant" of "the temptations of evil." His theory of redemption brings the Deity temporarily into the natural universe, in order to become acquainted with it, which, of course, implies that he was not acquainted with it before, since the incarnation was a fact in time.

We have occupied ourselves so much with the criticism of the main argument of the book, that we have no space to speak of many interesting points, nor to give several striking passages which we had marked for quotation. Our business has been to find fault, but there is much in the volume which has given us great contentment. We cannot fail to recognize a true Christian experience as the basis of the volume, the true Pauline

antinomianism, though pushed to an extreme. The merit of the book in its theology is, that it assumes the ground of Rational Supernaturalism, which seems to us to be the only true one. Mr. James's mind is metaphysical rather than logical. He sweeps the whole ground, and gives us glimpses of every part, but omits the processes by which his results are legitimated. Consequently, it is not easy to understand or to do justice to his position; a difficulty which we have felt in writing this article.

We thank him, individually, for the stimulus of his earnest and original thoughts; and, though frankly differing from him, would testify our respect for the high spiritual insight, and large reach of intellect, which this as every other work of the writer plainly intimates. If we have anywhere, in statement or argument, failed to do him justice, we will as frankly acknowledge our error.

J. F. C.

NOTICES OF RECENT PUBLICATIONS.

Christianity, its Essence and Evidence: or, An Analysis of the New Testament into Historical Facts, Doctrines, Opinions, and Phraseology. By GEORGE W. BURNAP, D. D. Boston; Crosby, Nichols, & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 410.

On a previous page we entertain the question as to the continued adherence of Mr. Norton's pupils in the opinions derived from him, after a trial of their sufficiency through their own maturer studies and in their ministry to others. From dealing with that question we turned to the perusal of this volume, which is from the pen of one of the most devoted and faithful of all our ministers, — one who went from the seat of instruction under the honored and beloved teacher just named, to undertake the duties of a ministry that has now covered nearly thirty years. Dr. Burnap has united the assiduous labors of a pastor over a large Christian society with those of a close student, and so his various publications, while they contain the processes and the results of sound scholarship, are also occupied with themes of living interest, and are written in a style which adapts them to the use of large classes in the community. No one of Mr. Norton's pupils has worked more faithfully in the direction of his studies than has Dr. Burnap, and no one of them has adhered more closely to the

general views of Scripture criticism and interpretation advanced in the volumes we have already reviewed. We do not mean to imply that the pupil has adopted any of his views merely because he was taught them, or that he has accepted them through force of any other considerations than the best ones of thorough and independent investigation. On the contrary, Dr. Burnap gives us in all his works full proof that he has formed all his own opinions, and has reached all his own conclusions, by a most deliberate and truth-loving exercise of the well-disciplined faculties of his own mind. Even when we trace the nearest resemblance in general and particular views between himself and Mr. Norton, we always find a freshness and vigor in Dr. Burnap's pages which are to be accounted only to his own most healthful digestion of the materials on which a Christian scholar is nourished.

Dr. Burnap's volumes, the one before us especially, are excellent tests by which to try the consistency of the general views advanced in them with a living, working faith in the Gospel, and their sufficiency to meet and satisfy the conflict of opinions in intelligent minds. We accord to his works a very high value, because of their full recognition and their candid treatment of the difficulties that are pressed by scepticism and philosophy, and also because of their cogency and ability in meeting these difficulties with solid arguments and unanswerable pleas for truth. He gives us the results of deep thought and large study, without any encumbrances of pedantry. His style is admirably adapted to his subject. His topics are those which have been discussed by many men of marked ability, while they have been prejudiced to one or another class of readers by a superficial, or a bigoted, or an unsatisfactory treatment. The volume before us—of the contents of which we will now proceed to give a sketch—is designed as a continuation of the author's "*Lectures on the History of Christianity.*"

In an Introductory Discourse, Dr. Burnap advances the general and comprehensive statement, that the continuance of the Christian religion in the world, as expressed in the existence at this day of the Christian Church, is to be consistently accounted for only by a belief in Jesus Christ as a miraculously attested messenger from God, as the corner-stone of his religion, as a risen and ever-living Saviour. The various theories and suppositions which have been offered to account for the facts of Christian history and experience, without an admission of the supernatural element, are briefly adverted to in a manly way, receiving a fair exposition and a word of reply. The author then announces his purpose to be, "to analyze the New Testament into its constituent elements; to show that it is not a homogeneous book,—that it contains various elements, such as His-

TORY, DOCTRINES, OPINIONS, and PHRASEOLOGY." Proceeding upon this method, Dr. Burnap undertakes to present the great historical facts which authenticate Christianity; to select some of the original doctrines which constitute the emphatic peculiarity and value of the religion; to allow for certain floating opinions of the age which became more or less incidentally incorporated with its apostolic records; and to clear up some of the perplexities involved in some technical words and phrases. Seven Discourses are devoted to an exhibition of historical facts, as follows: — the Resurrection of Christ, as holding the place of fundamental importance in the faith and the preaching of the Apostles, as directly attested by their positive testimony, and indirectly confirmed by the change which it wrought in their character, conduct, opinions, and feelings, and as giving authority to what Christ had taught, especially to his doctrine of the immortality of the soul; the tokens of historic truth in the Reality of Persons, Times, and Places mentioned in the New Testament, leading us to the conviction that we are reading of actual verities within the period of history, and impressing us with a belief of the *consistency* of the narrative; the Consciousness of Christ that he held an immediate supernatural communication with God, as indicated by every feeling, word, and deed of his, and as conformed to that law by which every being is adjusted to, and acts in accordance with, his own consciousness and position; the Claims of Christ to superhuman wisdom and supernatural power, to a spiritual relation to his disciples here, and to renewal of that relation in another life; the fact that Christ was without Sin, was morally perfect, and an example of every virtue; the Faith of the Apostles, as proved by their own thorough persuasion of mind and heart, and by the devoted fidelity and constancy of their lives; and finally, the Perfect Morality of the Gospel, as exacting a most rigid and uncompromising virtue, as resting necessarily upon a true theology, and as able to work a moral revolution, and so attesting the absolute integrity and the superhuman endowments of Jesus.

Having thus presented the credentials of Christ, Dr. Burnap aims next to ascertain the message which he brought, and the truths which he revealed or confirmed. Then follow discourses upon the Personality of God, the doctrine which quickens and assures faith, engages the heart, and reaches the conscience; the Paternity of God, by which, besides being the creatures of God, as are also the brutes around us, we become his children by nature and adoption both; the Efficacy of Prayer, as justified on philosophical principles, and enhanced to us by faith in Christ; the Forgiveness of Sins, — the certainty of it as a doctrine, the conditions of mercy, and the assurance of it to our

faith ; the doctrine of Immortality, as authenticated, in addition to the light or the intimations of nature, by the argument derived from the religious nature of man, by the supernatural knowledge of Christ, and by his own resurrection ; and the doctrine of Retribution, as made to rest upon the nature and the elements of the character of a moral being. In this Discourse Dr. Burnap states it as an inference of his own mind, though not as a lesson of revelation, that the consequences in a future life of unrepented sin in this life will be disciplinary and limited.

The third division of Dr. Burnap's volume embraces five Discourses, treating of subjects which come under his distinction as *Opinions*. These relate to some prominent topics collateral to religion, in relation to which he thinks the Saviour used, without considering it worth his while to criticise it, the language and imagery that expressed the prevailing ideas of the Jews. The subjects treated in these five Discourses are, The Interpretation of the Old Testament, by adopting from it certain coincident terms, as involving prophecies of a great many specific incidents ; — the belief in Demoniactal Possession, in treating of which Dr. Burnap takes for granted that the suppositions on which that belief was based were wholly false, which is more than any of us know ; he regards the Saviour as having allowed the popular opinion on this subject, and also upon the locality of *heaven* and *hell*, to go unquestioned, lest he should rouse against him a needless opposition to his strictly religious teachings ; — the belief in a Personal Devil, a topic which seems to fall equally under the classification of *opinions* and of *phraseology*, as so much of the language which refers to such an agent is inconsistent with any uniform conception of him ; it is from Milton and his rabbinical lore, rather than from any lesson of revelation, that the popular view of Satan is derived. The other two Discourses relating to *opinions* treat of the belief in the Return of Christ to the Earth during the lifetime of the first generation of Christians. Dr. Burnap brings together several texts from which he infers that the Apostles held to this as an opinion, a strong expectation of their own, though they did not advance it as a Christian doctrine ; and he affirms that the Saviour gave them no ground for entertaining it, but that, on the contrary, his own prophecy of the extension of the Gospel over the whole world was inconsistent with so speedy a destruction of this globe as was made a preliminary to the millennium.

Under the fourth and last division of the volume, we have six Discourses treating of that element in the New Testament record, which is to be accounted to the use of conventional forms of speech. The Jewish religion, which was essentially preparatory for the Gospel, had led the people whom it influ-

enced to fashion out certain religious conceptions of their own, and certain phrases for expressing them ; and thus certain stereotyped modes of conception and of speech had become current, which might or might not accord with truth in belief or with fitness in language. The author is thus led to investigate the import of the phrases, "The Kingdom of God," distinguishing its just and its inadequate or erroneous associations ; "Christ a King," which he is by the power of the truth, and not by a temporal sway ; "Jesus, the Son of God," as interpreted historically before Christ, then by Christ and his Apostles, and by Christians ever since ; the "Priesthood of Christ,"—leading to the inquiry whether it is a fundamental doctrine of the Gospel that Christ performs any properly priestly function ; "Sacrificial Language," which Dr. Burnap maintains as applied to Christ is used figuratively by analogy, and for illustration by comparison, and never literally ; and finally, "Regeneration," which as a technical word is a figure of speech, and must be interpreted, with an allowance for phraseology, as signifying *spiritual renovation*.

If we proposed to enter into any criticism of the author's views, we should raise a question with him on the matter of the references by the Apostolic writers to the Old Testament Scriptures. We believe the easiest way of solving all the perplexities which this subject presents is, by affirming and allowing that the elder Scriptures are filled with prophecies of the Messiah. The Saviour repeatedly asserted this, and over and over again implied it, even to the very pointed definition of the testimony borne to him in the three great divisions under which those Scriptures were classified. Three times does the author speak of the raising of Lazarus in terms affirming that it was "the most stupendous" of all the Saviour's miracles. But how are we to fix the scale of measurement or of estimate for such marvels ? Is one miracle more stupendous than another ?

One of the many great excellences of this volume is its skilful blending of the internal and the external evidences of the Gospel, so as in effect to give us a third method of arguing for its credibility and authority. We would commend the book to our readers as one admirably adapted to meet an existing want, because it addresses a very prevailing state of mind, and treats with plain and honest arguments the questions that have been opened between liberal men within and outside of our own communion.

Unitarian Views Vindicated. A Reply to Rev. Henry M. Denison's Review of "Unitarian Views." By JOHN H. HEYWOOD, Minister of the Unitarian Church, Louisville, Ky. Louisville: Hull & Brother. 1855. 16mo. pp. 156.

WE rejoice that any train of circumstances, even though involving a misrepresentation of our religious views, should have called forth so clear, succinct, and forcible a statement of the doctrines embraced by Unitarians. In the multitude of similar publications which a controversy extended over half a century has accumulated, we know of no single contribution to our cause better adapted to serve it well than this modest work of the devoted minister of Louisville. It breathes the very spirit of Christian gentleness in its remonstrances, and it carries with it the weight of the most cogent reasoning in its arguments. The simple method which the writer pursues, going directly to his point, avoiding all cumbersome details, and relying upon the discerning faculties which are common to all classes of persons, together with the earnest devoutness of his purpose, must make his volume a highly acceptable offering to the cause of Liberal Christianity in the West. The occasion of the publication was on this wise. Judge Pirtle had presented a report to the "Conference of Western Unitarian Churches" which was held in Louisville in May, 1854, and this report had been published, under the title of "Unitarian Views." Connected with this document, when it was read before the Conference, was a resolution designed to express in distinct terms the positive belief of Unitarians in the miraculous attestations and in the historical records of the Gospel. The Conference substituted for this another resolution, affirming its conviction that it had no right "to adopt any statement of belief as authoritative, or as a declaration of Unitarian faith, other than the New Testament itself, which is the divinely authorized rule both of faith and practice."

The report, however, was published in a little volume under the title of "Unitarian Views," and was subjected to a Review by the Rev. Mr. Denison, a minister of the Episcopal denomination. We know of this Review only through the account which Mr. Heywood gives of it, with a continuous reference to the language or arguments of the reviewer. The same personalities, misunderstandings, and misrepresentations which vitiate the simple intent of controversial writers to serve the cause of religious truth, appear in Mr. Denison's pages, and we should certainly infer that, if he is not better informed in other departments of professional training than he is in reference to our opinions, he would do well to assume the seat of a learner. Mr. Heywood undertakes, patiently and gently, yet with the

earnest zeal of an advocate of precious truth, to lead Mr. Denison through a course of instruction in the views generally entertained by Unitarians. We are not without hope that Mr. Denison himself will be induced to form a more favorable opinion of those whom his critic represents. But we are sure that the circulation of this little volume at the West will be of incalculable service to our cause.

The Republican Court; or, American Society in the Days of Washington. By RUFUS WILMOT GRISWOLD. With Twenty-one Portraits of Distinguished Women, engraved from Original Pictures. New and Revised Edition. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. Royal 8vo. pp. 408.

THIS elegant volume was received by acclamation on its first appearance, and the edition was not sufficient to satisfy the eager demands of the holiday season. We are quite certain that the sober second judgment of the public will confirm the first opinion, and in some respects magnify its approbation. It was received then chiefly as a book of original and beautiful embellishments, quite the thing for the parlor table. Its solid literary merits are yet to be fully appreciated. We do not know where else one half so much information regarding early American society can be found, as in these four hundred handsome pages; and it seems to us that the publishers would do well to print the text in a cheap edition by itself, as a popular memoir of persons and times, interesting to the people at large.

It is to be hoped that we are to have more publications of the same kind, and that our ancient families will not allow the letters, diaries, and other memorials of the good old days to die out under the assaults of moths and broomsticks. The aspect of the age is sometimes far more graphically given by a gossipy letter, or a few lines of a contemporary journal, than in any more ponderous historical disquisition. Dr. Griswold has evidently been much favored in the use of private family memorials, and he has worked up his material with much artistic taste in the grouping, and great spirit in the narrative. The volume stands among our important historical monuments, and cannot but be interesting on the other side of the water.

The work would have lost something of its gala character, (yet would not have lost in true worth,) if it had aimed at a less exclusive social mark, and tried to give us some glimpses of society in lowlier ranks and more rustic quarters. What would be more instructive and taking than portraits of our good mothers in their maiden or matronly days, whether useful in the vil-

lage farm or church, or brilliant in city drawing-rooms? The difficulty, however, lies mainly in the costliness and rarity of portraits in the olden time, which made them available only to the wealthy. In these days, when everybody and everything is sitting to the sunshine for a portrait, we are treasuring up materials for a pictorial history of costume and character such as the world has never before seen. Certainly all America has been photographed, and if matters go on as of late biography will be as universal as photography.

The Appletons deserve credit for bringing out the handsomest illustrated American work ever published in this country. They are preparing a still more splendid volume for the next autumn, upon a subject directly religious. We have been favored with the sight of a specimen copy. In point of engravings and press-work their edition of Overbeck's "Illustrations of the Gospels" will be by far the most superb book ever brought out in America. It is edited by one of our own ministers.

The Chemistry of Common Life. By JAMES F. JOHNSTON, M. A., F. R. S., F. G. S., etc., etc., Author of "Lectures on Agricultural Chemistry and Geology," "A Catechism of Agricultural Chemistry and Geology," etc. Illustrated with numerous Wood Engravings. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 2 vols. 12mo. pp. 291, 381.

THESE two volumes are intended to enlighten the unscientific reader as to the world by which he is every moment surrounded; the air which passes in and out of his lungs; the water which he drinks; the bread and beef which, if he is able to purchase them, he eats; the teas, the coffees, the cocoas, in which he indulges; the beers, the wines, the brandies, which are forbidden to him by the law of the land; the legion of narcotics which the eager craving of man for at least a few hours of quiet has brought to light. They are very readable and very instructive books, and are the more satisfactory perhaps, because, unlike some productions of the kind, they are not fitted to discourage us from eating or drinking anything, or to confirm us in a constant uneasiness about meat and drink, than which nothing can be more fatal to health and spirits. Mr. Johnson has presented in his pages some very curious details as to the effects of the cocoa-leaf and of arsenic, not to forget the humble toadstool or haschisch, which from time immemorial has been known to the Siberian as a most powerful narcotic.

In commending these volumes, as we most heartily do, to our

readers, perhaps we ought to counsel them to procure at the same time Dr. Carpenter's admirable work on the use and abuse of alcoholic drinks, for Mr. Johnson certainly does not say a great deal to uphold the legislation which has been adopted by our rulers with reference to spirituous liquors; indeed, as it seems to us, his views upon this subject require very important qualifications.

A Collection of Familiar Quotations, with complete Indices of Authors and Subjects. Cambridge: John Bartlett. 1855. 12mo. pp. 295.

We take much delight in dictionaries of all kinds. Such books are dry only to the dry, and he who can find no romance in vocabularies need never hope to find "sermons in stones." The great Lord Chatham, who had some bad habits and many good ones, was in nothing wiser than in his way of reading quaint old "Bailey" for inspiration before he made a speech.

And we are always ready to take up Scaliger's thanksgiving over a new dictionary. Were we to make any exceptions in this matter, we might strike out dictionaries of men, *directories* so called, which may indeed help to bring us to our friends, but are sure to bring our bores to us. For the particular sort of dictionary which Mr. Bartlett has been at the pains of preparing we are especially grateful. For the question of "quotations" is one of the inevitable miseries of social life. There is no circle, of the least pretensions to "literature," which does not comprise one or more individuals whose felicity consists in hunting their acquaintances into despair, and who will give you no rest till you have "proved your title" to every phrase that you may chance to use. Who has not looked forward to the time when "every gentleman's library" should be furnished with the means of instantaneously abating such nuisances; to the day when a single step from the dinner-table to the book-case would deliver the tormented from the tormentor?

Mr. Murray, of London, who has done so much in a quiet way for human happiness by publishing his Traveller's Guides, tried last year to help us with a "Handbook of Quotations"; but the work, though well planned, was inadequately executed. Mr. Bartlett has greatly improved upon this humane attempt. His fair little volume is the result of very considerable labor. The quotations are arranged chronologically, and are made accessible by an admirable Index. To say that the book completely meets our wants, would be extravagant; but it is by far the best of its kind, and if the public want a better they can

easily secure it, by thankfully buying up the present edition, which we advise them to do. The editor promises, in such case, to continue and to perfect his work; and in the hope that he may find good reason for doing so, we shall take the liberty of forwarding to him our own observations on certain *hiatus* which should be filled.

We have spoken of the use of this work as a weapon of defence. But it may be otherwise made valuable. The juxtaposition of phrases in the Index often throws light on the peccadilloes of the great. Pilfering Tom Campbell stands there convicted, with Master John Norris's little ewe lamb in his arms; there are jackdaws dropping their borrowed plumes, and peacocks in their turn caught robbing the jackdaw of his one pretty feather. Over such a book it would be possible to moralize much; and the veriest "Know-Nothing" may learn something as he turns its pages, if he will but take the trouble to estimate how much of his daily debts of speech he could decently defray without the help of foreign genius and of alien wit.

The Druses of the Lebanon. Their Manners, Customs, and History, with a Translation of their Religious Code. By GEORGE WASHINGTON CHASSEAUD, late of Beyrout, Syria. London: Richard Bentley. 1855. 8vo. pp. 422.

SINCE the article in our May number was published, a work bearing the above title has come to hand. The Preface and Dedication are high-sounding, and will awaken large expectations in the mind of the inexperienced reader. But the mountain in this instance produces only a contemptible mouse. Long before the closing chapters are reached, and inadvertent disclosure of the author's age is made, it will have become sufficiently evident that Mr. Chasseaud was in his teens when he wrote the book. An italic line at the foot of the title-page informs us that "the author reserves to himself the right of translation." No one, we think, will interfere with this right. We trust, however, that the author writes foreign tongues better than he writes English, else the translations of his work will speedily find their way to the trunk-makers.

Mr. Chasseaud makes great boast of his opportunities, and ought to be able to write well about the Syrian tribes, since he was born in Beyrout, and his father seems to have held the position of English Consul in that city. But his book gives no proof that he has either the wit to understand, or the industry to examine, the condition, the character, and the faith of the strange race which he has undertaken to describe. It is clear

that he has never read the Baron de Sacy's work. Churchill's work he has certainly read, since all the reliable statements which he makes are borrowed from that accurate author; yet, with unblushing impudence, he omits all mention, not only of his own indebtedness, but even of the existence of such a work. To show his independence, he alters the spelling of the Arabic names, and bravely undertakes to libel some of the Druse heroes whom Churchill has sketched so well. We may safely affirm, that, wherever Mr. Chasseaud expresses an opinion of his own, it is groundless and worthless. His practical acquaintance with the Druse tribes we should judge to be confined to occasional interviews with traders, and to one or two brief visits to the mountains around Beyrout.

Mr. Chasseaud's style "verges on the poetical." His sentences are splendidly decorated with sonorous metaphors, every noun has its full share of adjectives, its chapters are all headed with elegant extracts, mostly from English poets, — Byron, Mrs. Hemans, Crabbe, and others, — with Isaiah and Ezekiel once or twice thrown in; and the poverty of facts is fully supplied by the writer's redundant fancy. His pictures dazzle and bewilder by their excess of light. He is not afraid to coin new words, and offers new and various readings both of the English and Arabic. Delicious is the elaborate analogy three pages long drawn between a Druse maiden and an unblown rose-bud. Extraordinary is the version of the Druse *dinner* chant, — enough to spoil one's appetite for a week, if the original were as tedious as the English paraphrase. To *enjoy* anything, in Mr. Chasseaud's vernacular, is "to bask under" it. The *records* of anything are its "*calends*." Sometimes the phrases are mystical in their obscurity, as when we read that in war sharp-shooters "hack and hue away," or when we read of the "desperate hardisome."

Mr. Chasseaud thrice essays to declare the *origin* of the Druses, and thrice breaks down in the attempt. He would fain connect them with the Hivites of the Pentateuch, but the chasm of twenty or thirty centuries is rather too wide to be filled even by his imagination. In order to take a broad look upon history, he goes up upon the great Pyramid and watches the ages from Noah down to Napoleon; but, while the patriarchs close up very well, and the Genesis procession comes along in good style, the rear ranks lag sadly behind. In default of a good account of the origin of the sect, he tries, by a translation of a Druse manuscript, to furnish a condensed view of the *creed*. He does not, nevertheless, profess to understand it.

We had noted various other tempting morsels for criticism, but want of space compels us to exclude them. On page 264

there are some edifying remarks upon the greatness of *small* men, suggested by the diminutive stature of the Emir Fakavadeen, which lead us to imagine that the proportions of Mr. Chasseaud are not gigantic. It is too bad that he should class his great namesake, "George Washington," with those who are "specimens of caskets of great value contained within a diminutive space."

An American among the Orientals, including an Audience with the Sultan, and a Visit to the Interior of a Turkish Harem.

By JAMES E. P. BOULDEN, M. D. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston. 12mo. pp. 178.

The Turkish Empire, embracing the Religion, Manners, and Customs of the People, with a Memoir of the reigning Sultan and Omer Pacha. By EDWARD JOY MORRIS, Author of *Travels in the East*, etc. Second Edition. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston. 12mo. pp. 216.

WE have here two new volumes upon Turkey, to which, by way of relief, we should be glad to add as a third Lord Carlisle's delightful Diary, were not the title of that already attached to an article in the preceding pages. There is, however, considerable contrast in the two which we have here. The first is a sophomoric production, of which the friends of the author will be ashamed now, and the author himself will most likely be ashamed in a twelvemonth. It is well printed, well bound, but its only literary merit is brevity. It furnishes not a particle of new or useful information about Turkey, describes in the most turgid, extravagant, and foolish style scenes that have been a hundred times described, moralizes in the most comical way, abounds in ludicrously misplaced italics, and leaves us wondering how the author of such trash ever got the degree of M. D. It is a true Oriental book only in the amount and the absurdity of its hyperbole. We had marked several passages as model specimens of commonplace and bathos; but they multiplied so fast that we shall spare our readers. We offer a single instance of the fervid eloquence of Dr. Boulden, taken from what was evidently intended to be, in the flash language of cockney tourists, a "stunner."

"Millions of reams of paper and oceans of ink have been consumed, and the human language almost exhausted, in faint endeavors to describe the glorious and magnificent picture afforded by the approach from the Sea of Marmora to Constantinople."

Read that aloud, and say if it is not enough.

The other volume is of a different kind. It is not remarkably well printed, but it contains a great deal of valuable information in a small compass. It is chiefly a compilation, and in its English dress has interesting matter added by the accomplished translator. Sketches are given of all the members of the Turkish government, the Sultan and the various Pachas; a rapid but very excellent summary of Turkish history from Mahomet to Abdel Medjid follows; and the book is closed by a description of Turkish manners and customs, the political and religious condition of the Turkish empire, and a very complete and generally accurate statement of the geography of the empire, with its principal towns, forts, islands, pachalics, etc. In the appendix are a few documents which illustrate the beginning of the present war. The book, as a whole, is the best manual that we know for reference about Turkey. Its mistakes are very few and slight. Abbas Pasha, the *late* (not the present, as the book says) viceroy of Egypt, was not the eldest *son*, but the *grandson*, of Mehemet Ali. The origin of Gothic architecture can hardly be found in the Saracen style, though undoubtedly the horse-shoe arch modified the old Norman type. The American translator ought to have given Dr. Howe his right name in the account of the Greek Revolution. In the list of mountain ranges, the Taurus, the longest, the most lofty, and the most historically famous, is quite omitted. There are several errors, too, in the estimate of population. Aleppo is put too high, Damascus too low, and the same observation is true concerning the estimate of the Syrian ports. The abstinence of the Turks from wine, too, is rather too strongly stated, and the morals of the ruling class are not so good as the writer would have us believe. The book, however, is well worth buying.

Another Budget; or, Things which I saw in the East. By JANE ANTHONY EAMES, Author of a Budget of Letters, etc. Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 8vo. pp. 481.

THERE is a great deal of matter in this volume. Mrs. Eames saw several things which most travellers do not see, and not a few things which were not, as we imagine, worth seeing. Her book, which is without preface, is merely a collection of forty-four letters, very rapidly written, on the ways of travel, and filled with such pleasant gossip as a woman, delighted and disgusted, excited and fatigued, by turns, might send to her friends at home. The composition of the letters, not to say the punctuation, might have been improved by more careful revision. The issue of the volume seems to have been hurried. There is rather more ego-

tism in it than perfect taste would allow ; but we are less annoyed by this, since it is so honest and unconscious. Mrs. Eames's book is not dull. Whoever takes it up will go on with it, and will find plenty of amusement in its animated pages. The lack of antiquarian learning is made up by the minuteness of detail about everyday life in Egypt. It is an instructive book for any lady to read who thinks of trying a journey across the long Arabian desert. Mrs. Eames promises another similar volume about Europe if this should be favorably received. We learn that the second edition was issued almost simultaneously with the first.

Memories of Youth and Manhood. By SIDNEY WILLARD.
Cambridge : John Bartlett. 1855. 2 vols. 16mo. pp.
351, 334.

To every living alumnus of Harvard these pleasant volumes of Mr. Willard will be heartily welcome, as offering them either some agreeable aids in reviving their own reminiscences, or as imparting information which is new to them. We were of those who, during the college course, were numbered among the pupils of Professor Willard, regarding him with the respect due to his place, his age, his fidelity as an instructor, and his worth as an excellent and exemplary man. We remember also to have been standing near him in the College yard three or four years since, when, as he says in his Preface, some friends who were his juniors by the term of a generation asked him to write some memorials of his own time and of his connection with the University. It was a reasonable request, though received at the moment by a modest smile, which implied surprise and doubt. For ourselves we express to the honored and estimable author our gratitude for the rich instruction which he has afforded us, and we cannot withhold the utterance of our satisfaction that these pages, dealing as they do with some of the most critical points in the College history, are written with so much discretion, moderation, and candor. There is a vivacity also in the style, and a judgment exhibited in the selection of materials, and in the space devoted to incidental topics, which show that seventy-five years of laborious and various service have not abated the intellectual powers, but have mellowed the heart, of the writer. Beginning with the memorials of an honored ancestry, — and no man in the Commonwealth has a nobler lineage, — Mr. Willard gives us glimpses of men and times in former generations, which always will afford pleasure to the descendants of the honored stock of New England. A very full record is made of the life of his distinguished father, the President of the College,

of the straits to which the institution was reduced during and immediately after the close of the Revolutionary war, when his presidency began, and of the efforts which he so successfully made to rally its resources and to advance its prosperity. Wrought in with this narrative we find a very interesting sketch of the origin of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, of which President Willard was the first Corresponding Secretary, accompanied by biographical notices of eminent men at home and abroad, whose names appear on its list. Coming down to the period which is strictly within the scope of his own memory and personal experience, Mr. Willard offers us on every page matter which we read with the most fixed attention, and with that zest which, as has often been remarked, gives to the unhistorical era just previous to our own generation a charm such as attaches to no other portion of the world's annals. The incidental information bearing upon the theological controversies and the literary projects of the last half-century, in our immediate community, is of the most authentic and important character. Again would we express to the author our gratitude for his work.

A School of Life. By ANNA MARY HOWITT, Author of "An Art-Student in Munich." Boston: Ticknor and Fields. 1855. 16mo. pp. 266.

THAT great philosophical thinker, Sir James Mackintosh, has left upon record his belief "that fictitious narrative, in all its forms, — epic poem, tale, tragedy, romance, novel, — is one of the grand instruments employed in the moral education of mankind; because it is only delightful when it interests; and to interest is to excite sympathy for the heroes of the fiction; that is, in other words, to teach men the habit of feeling for others." Doubtless he was correct in this, as he was generally in his speculative reasoning. Yet the remark needs some qualification, since it is certain that the sympathies of the habitual novel-reader are blunted rather than quickened by weeping over the imaginary griefs of the heroes and heroines of fashionable tales. On the other hand, nothing can be more certain than that the occasional perusal of fictitious works exercises a healthful influence upon the reader, by appealing to a part of his nature which is not called out by other literary productions. In order, however, that such an influence should be exercised, it is necessary that any work of fiction should possess artistic merit, a noble aim, and purity of tone. Where these three indispensable requisites are united, the book becomes an active influence for good, and its author is a genuine benefactor. But, without pursuing this

train of thought farther, we need only apply these principles to the volume before us to perceive their full force.

A *School of Life* is the production of a young author, who is only known in this country by a very pleasant volume descriptive of the life of an Art-Student in Munich, but who unites the characters of artist and author, and gives rich promise in both. Her enthusiasm for art, and the delight with which she lingers over her descriptions of natural scenery, form, indeed, a particular feature in her new volume. Added to this, the high and noble purpose underlying it, the artistic skill with which the plot is conceived, and the general ability with which it is developed, stamp the work as one of no common merit and interest. The book has, it is true, some obvious defects; but the faults are those of youth and insufficient practice. Portions of it are carelessly written; some things are unnatural; and the principal characters show that the writer has not yet mastered the secret springs of human action. But, making large allowance for these defects, enough remains to justify our praise, and to illustrate the truth of Sir James Mackintosh's opinion. In reading it, one can hardly fail to have his best sympathies aroused, and to feel himself nerved with a stronger will to overcome every foe upon the battle-field of life.

The Poetical Works of JOHN DRYDEN. With Life, Critical Dissertation, and Explanatory Notes, by the REV. GEORGE GILFILLAN. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 2 vols. Svo. pp. xxiv. and 314; xxiv. and 344.

THESE volumes form a part of the elegant series of the British Poets now in course of publication by the Messrs. Appleton & Co., in connection with an extensive publishing-house in Edinburgh, where the volumes are printed. In convenience of form, beauty of typography, and cheapness of price, this edition leaves nothing to be desired. Its typographical appearance would bring no discredit upon the libraries of the rich; and its price will not prevent it from finding a place upon the shelves of the poor. Of the editorial qualifications of the Rev. Mr. Gilfillan, however, we cannot speak in very high terms. His own taste is so equivocal, and his style so vicious, that he is but a blind guide to the beauties of English poetry. The notes which he has appended to the volumes before us are few, brief, and unimportant; and for this, intelligent readers will feel grateful. But the *Life of Dryden*, and the critical estimate of Dryden's genius and works, are written in his usual grandiloquent and self-satisfied manner, and exhibit the characteristic vices of his

style. Some choice flowers of rhetoric might readily be culled from his overwrought pages, by any one disposed for such employment.

In his survey of Dryden's life and works, he fails to do justice to those qualities of mind which made him the greatest of our secondary poets. To the first rank Dryden has no claim, but within his own sphere he is unrivalled; and it is precisely here that Mr. Gilfillan fails to perceive and comprehend the sources of his power. His plays were a failure, and he never rose to the sublime heights which Milton attained; but it can never be forgotten that he has enriched our literature with the finest political poem, and with some of the most brilliant satires, ever written. A complete master of the art of versification, though often careless, a scholar, and a wit, he rendered the character of a literary man respectable in a degenerate age by the splendor of his talents; and he was long regarded as an acknowledged authority in all that pertains to English poetry.

A Commonplace Book of Thoughts, Memories, and Fancies, Original and Selected. Part I. *Ethics and Character.* Part II. *Literature and Art.* By MRS. JAMESON. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 329.

FEW women of the present day have done more to elevate the intellectual standard of their sex than Mrs. Jameson. With a mind enriched by travel and various reading, great industry, and a refined and cultivated taste, she has written much and well on many subjects. Several of her works, in truth, stand at the head of the class to which they belong. Occupying such a rank among female writers, it is an interesting study to trace the development of her mind, and to analyze the processes of its growth. In the volume before us we have some of the materials for such an investigation, in her brief citations from books which she had read and her careless comments and unstudied memoranda of thoughts and reflections. "For many years," she tells us, "I have been accustomed to make a memorandum of any thought which might come across me (if pen and paper were at hand), and to mark (and *remark*) any passage in a book which excited either a sympathetic or an antagonistic feeling. This collection of notes accumulated insensibly from day to day. The volumes on Shakespeare's Women, on Sacred and Legendary Art, and various other productions, sprung from seed thus lightly and casually sown, which, I hardly know how, grew up and expanded into a regular, readable form, with a beginning, a

middle, and an end." A portion of these scattered notes which remained after the composition of her published works has been collected and printed at the request of some of her friends. They are of course somewhat miscellaneous in their character, yet they have certain general affinities, and are judiciously distributed under appropriate heads. Many of the passages quoted are striking and suggestive ; and Mrs. Jameson's own remarks are often singularly felicitous. They are valuable as food for thought, apart from their interest in connection with her literary culture.

Leaves from a Family Journal. From the French of EMILE SOUVESTRE, Author of "The Attic Philosopher in Paris." New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 277.

THIS is an autobiographic sketch of domestic life in one of the provincial towns of France, written in a quiet, unpretending manner, but replete with the lessons of practical wisdom. The story is somewhat commonplace, and portions are rather prolix and heavy ; but the characters are well drawn, and the simplicity of its style, the purity of its moral tone, and the homely truths which it inculcates, will recommend it to a numerous class of readers. Opening with the marriage of the hero and heroine, the diarist unfolds his family history through many years, until their children, having reached maturity, prepare to leave the family circle for new homes of their own. In the course of the narrative we are introduced to several striking characters, whose judicious counsels to the youthful couple constitute a principal attraction in the volume. Of these the most noticeable are the aunt of the heroine and the hero's father. Both are marked characters, and their individual peculiarities are well discriminated. In their conversation is embodied much of the shrewd common sense and practical acquaintance with the world which so largely characterize the volume. With little pretension to brilliancy, the book is a very good specimen of the French moral tale.

The Life of Sir William Pepperell, Bart. By USHER PARSONS. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. 1855. 12mo. pp. 352.

THE author of this volume of biography has shown good judgment, fidelity, and zeal in his way of commemorating a man who deserved such a memorial. Pepperell won his own distinctions. His mercantile, political, civil, military, and private life, each present points of interest, and are set before us in these pages in a way that does him justice, and interests the reader.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

Calvin's Letters. — There is in course of publication in Paris a complete series of all the letters of John Calvin which the most diligent research through public and private repositories has succeeded in discovering. The French edition will contain the letters in their Latin and French originals. Dr. Jules Bonnet, the editor, has devoted five years of assiduous investigation and study to the task necessary for the success of this undertaking. The letters of Calvin are found to extend over a period of twenty-six years, beginning in May, 1528, when, in his nineteenth year, he was a student at the University of Orleans, and ending with what he dictated from his death-bed in May, 1564. A few days before the closing scene, in conversation with Beza, he requested that a selection might be made from his letters and presented to the Reformed Churches as the last token of his affectionate interest. Beza delegated a share in this trust to that admiring disciple and friend of Calvin, Charles de Jonvillers, who, with the aid of others, formed the epistolary collection of autographs in the library of Geneya, and published in that city, in 1575, a selection of the letters, accompanied by some of the replies to them. After the lapse of nearly three centuries it seemed but fitting that the work should be resumed, with a view to a more complete collection, and to a publication of such of the documents as were withheld from print by the scruples of the first editors. That first collection contained some four hundred and twenty separate letters or memoirs, of which two hundred and eighty-four were from Calvin's pen. From the large addition which research among the archives of Switzerland, France, Germany, and England has enabled Dr. Bonnet to make to his collection, English readers are to have a selection which will embrace in all at least six hundred of the Reformer's own epistles, accompanied by such notes as may be necessary to explain the text. In this selection the letters will be translated from the Latin and French originals by Mr. David Constable, assisted by Dr. Cunningham, Principal of the New College in Edinburgh.

By an arrangement made with the Scotch firm of Thomas Constable & Co., Messrs. Little, Brown, & Co. of this city become joint publishers of this most valuable and important work, in four handsome octavo volumes, the first of which has already appeared. We have examined this sufficiently to assure ourselves that we have before us a most interesting and profitable task in its perusal, and to feel moved to commend the work to our readers as one eminently deserving of their attention. It is not designed to serve any partisan purpose, but to be as faithful a presentment of the mind, heart, and soul of the stern Reformer as he was himself able to convey to friends and foes. No more authentic pages are offered to us in the voluminous chronicles of men and times which are always to aid in shaping the fortunes and the faith of Christendom.

Materials for the History of Massachusetts. — The year that is now passing has been so far a signal one for the rich contributions which it

has already made to the province of history as relating to this Commonwealth. We have before us four great works, — one of them in a complete state, the other three, instalments of promised undertakings yet awaiting completion, and we expect, ere the year has closed, to see another which shall crown a wish that had been well-nigh surrendered as vain, — all which works have to do with the annals of Massachusetts. Each of them is worthy of a separate and a full examination in our pages, and we hope that time and opportunity will soon allow us to pay to them respectively that deserved tribute. We must content ourselves now with a brief notice of them.

Dr. N. B. Shurtleff, of Boston, has faithfully completed the responsible office intrusted to him, in fulfilment of a legislative enactment, by procuring the transcription and printing of the "Records of the Governor and Company of the Massachusetts Bay." Here are five volumes, — six, in fact, as one of them is divided into two parts, — appearing in all the finished elegance of modern typography, an expressive tribute from the public wealth of the present day to those honored legislators who, in the day of small things, planned and labored for posterity. We handle the volumes with reverence. We turn over their pages with a glow of pride. The world cannot match them. Their contents are unique, their spirit and purpose, their materials, and the comments which experience has written upon their promises and issues, all impress us with the sense of a mysterious presence and influence, which we will interpret as a witness to that Providence which was so real and controlling an element in the faith of our fathers. Dr. Shurtleff has spared no pains in giving us a verbal, and in some respects a fac-simile, transcript of these Records. His responsibility did not extend to the work of annotation, and he has been content to offer, in some modest prefatory remarks, such information upon the condition and chirography of the original volumes as will enable the reader to appreciate the undertaking. Here, then, we have the Records, which begin with the meetings of a mercantile company in England, which continue with the transfer of the Colony charter and the establishment of a government in the Bay, and close in May, 1686, when the government of Massachusetts was committed to Joseph Dudley, as its President.

A fact which was brought to our knowledge at the monthly meeting of the Historical Society in June caused us a temporary feeling of chagrin in connection with these volumes; namely, that only after the completion of the work by elegant stereotype plates, and the transfer of their contents to the fairest paper, means were put within the hands of the editor for supplying some imperfections in the first volume. At the meeting just mentioned, Colonel Thomas Aspinwall, a member of the Society, who has recently returned home after discharging so long and so honorably the office of Consul of the United States in London, laid upon the table a very ancient copy of the first volume of the Records which supplies the defects of the original in our State-House. This precious volume he had obtained from a grandson in England of Governor Thomas Hutchinson, an historian of this Colony and Province, who probably took the volume with him when he sought refuge in the mother country from his unpopularity here at the breaking out of the Revolutionary war. Dr. Shurtleff will prepare some sheets to supply imperfections, which can be inserted in his own handsome volume.

The second work to which we refer is the first volume of a History of Massachusetts, by John Stetson Barry. The author designs to

complete his work in two more volumes. The cursory examination, which is all that we have had opportunity to bestow on the volume before us, — devoted to the Colonial period, — satisfies us that Mr. Barry has investigated diligently, and intends to give us an able and faithful statement of his important theme.

Another work, of which we have also the first volume, is an Ecclesiastical History of New England, by the Rev. Joseph B. Felt. In giving to his work this speciality of title, the author signifies the prominence into which he will bring the peculiarly religious element in our annals, though he does not neglect the mention of the civil and political elements which are intermingled with it. Mr. Felt has enjoyed rare opportunities for perfecting his plan, which is one of grateful and consecrated zeal in behalf of men whose memory he venerates, and whose work has had for him the richest blessing of God. We commend the volume to our readers, while we wait for the continuation before we review it.

Two other exceedingly agreeable and valuable volumes, from the pen of Josiah Gilbert Holland, are devoted to the History of Western Massachusetts, the Counties of Hampden, Hampshire, Franklin, and Berkshire. These are filled with matter of various interest, serious, romantic, quaint, and amusing, — a perfect mine of anecdote and authentic biographical and historical information.

The work to which we have referred as numbered among treasures supposed to be lost is Bradford's Historical Journal of the Plymouth Colony. This invaluable relic has been discovered in England, and will soon be published by the Historical Society.

The first of the three promised volumes of Washington Irving's Life of Washington has appeared, and is furnished to subscribers by Mr. Frederic Parker, in Cornhill, Boston. There is a charm in the work fully answering the high-raised expectations that had been cherished concerning it. We shall hope soon to present our estimate of its merits to our readers, if it shall prove that any of our readers fail to anticipate us by at once tasting of the pleasure for themselves.

The Messrs. Harper have published, in an elegant octavo volume, "Literary and Historical Miscellanies, by George Bancroft." These compositions are dated over a period of thirty years, and have, of course, very different merits; but there is signal ability, the hand of a master, and the mind of a profound scholar, in them all. We have read a portion of them with very absorbing interest and pleasure.

Messrs. Ticknor and Fields have published two very striking works by Charles Reade, a new claimant to literary fame. His "Peg Woffington" and "Christie Johnstone" are warmly commended as works of true genius.

ERRATUM.

Page 56, line 35, for "full-growing," read "full, groaning."